

H. 7. 65

THE
FUNERAL
OF THE
MASS:

OR,

The MASS Dead and Buried,
without hope of Resurrection.

Translated out of *French*.

The Seventh Edition, Corrected.

L O N D O N,

Printed for Randal Taylor, near Stationers-
Hall. 1685.



The P R E F A C E.

THE Author of this Piece was one Monsieur de Rodon, Philosophy Professor in the Royal Colledge at Nismes, a City of Languedoc in France, where it was written. But as soon as it was Printed, it was suppress'd by the command of Authority, prohibiting all persons to keep any of them, upon I know not what severe penalties; and such Copies as could be found, were publickly burnt by the Hang-man, about 1660. Whereupon the poor Gentleman, for fear of being condemn'd to keep company with his Books, was forced to fly to Geneva, where he not long after dyed. These severities of our Adversaries bring to my remembrance what a learned and ingenious Frenchman once told me, viz. That this small Tract hath more pettled their Party, than any one Piece that ever was extant in France since the Reformation of Religion there. Whether that be a mistake, I know not; but this I dare affirm, That though many famous men of that Kingdom have, in the memory of this Age, written very smartly against the Romish Heresies, yet there is not one of them whose Person and Writings have had such hard measure. Whence it appears, that our Author (his very Enemies being Judges) hath made

The Preface.

good what he undertook, viz. He hath destroyed that great Diana the Mass, and hath also, by way of prevention, destroyed all the Arguments made use of, by the Romish Doctors for the restoring and re-establishing of her: which he hath so well performed, that to this very day, not one of them hath dared so much as to attempt to revive her, by answering his Book; so that here you may see her laid in her Grave, without hope of Resurrection: and therefore the Book may very fully be termed, The Funeral of the Mass; and consequently, The Funeral of Romish Heresies and Idolatries, as the Author well observes. For the truth is, the Mass and the Romish Religion are almost convertible Terms; so that if the former be destroyed, the latter must vanish into its first Nothing: and therefore our Author having destroyed the Mass, hath destroyed the thing called Popery too. As for the monstrous Absurdities and Blasphemies which flow from this one Romish Doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass, they would fill whole Volumes; but I shall content my self to say, That the Mass consists of more gross and abominable Superstitions, Phantasmisms, and Idolatries, than ever have been believed or practised by the most ignorant Pagans, what the Tenets of the Romanists are, and what their Practices have been in reference to Protestant Magistrates and People, woful and
sad

The Preface.

Bad experience hath sufficiently taught the World. I shall only add, That they are as pernicious to our Bodies and Estates, as their Heretical Doctrines, and Idolatrous Services are to our Souls. And consequently, to introduce Popery into this Kingdom, would be an act as unpolitick as Anti-christian, as hath been demonstrated in that incomparable Piece, entituled, The Established Religion, in opposition to Popery. But because (I know not by what strange insatiation or enchantment; or rather by what wonderful Judgement of God) this monstrous, absurd, and destructive (shall I call it?) Religion prevails amongst us, I thought good to English and Print this small Treatise, as the best Antidote against Popery (the Holy Scripture excepted) that ever I read; and for ought I know, it is not inferiour to the best of this kind that ever was yet extant: to which opinion the harsh usage it hath had from our Adversaries, as aforesaid, doth certainly give no small testimony. But I know that the Holy Scripture it self cannot profit, except God be pleased to give his Blessing, much less can this Book: and therefore I earnestly beseech him, That he would make it prosperous and successful, for the good of Souls; and if any shall receive benefit by it, I desire them to give him all the glory, and then I shall think my self infinitely recompensed for my pains in translating it.

The Contents of the Chapters.

- Chap. I.
1. **C** Concerning the Exposition of these words
This is my Body. Page, 1
- Chap. II.
2. Concerning the Exposition of these words, He
that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my
blood hath eternal life. My flesh is meat
indeed, &c. 10
- Chap. III.
3. Against Transubstantiation. 19
- Chap. IV.
4. Against the real presence of Christs Body in
the Host or consecrated Wafer. 32
- Chap. V.
5. Against the adoration or worshipping of the
Host. 58
- Chap. VI.
6. Against the taking away of the Cup. 82
- Chap. VII.
7. Against the Mass. 95
- Chap. VIII.
8. Containing Answers to the objections of the
Romish Doctors. 116

THE
FUNERAL
OF THE
MASS.

CHAP. I.

Concerning the Exposition of these words, This is my Body.

THE *Romanists* are wont to tell us, that these words of Jesus Christ, *This is my Body*, are so clear to prove the Real Presence of Christs Body in the Host, and consequently to prove Transubstantiation (or the substantial conversion of the Bread into Christs Body) that they are amazed we cannot perceive so manifest a truth. Against which I form this Argument : He that speaks

contrary to the usage of all the world, and takes words otherwise than all other men do must without doubt, speak very obscurely. But if Jesus Christ by these words, *This is my Body*, had meant the real presence of his Body in the Host (as the *Romish* Doctors assert and consequently had meant the substantial conversion of the Bread into his Body, he had spoken contrary to the common usage of all the World, and hath taken the words otherwise than all other men do, which I thus prove. There was never any Author either sacred, or prophane that made use of such words as these, *This is my Body*, to signify the substantial conversion of one thing into another; or to signify the real presence of a thing immediately after the pronouncing of them, and not before. On the contrary, there was never any man that did not use them to signify, that the thing was already that which it was said to be. For example; When God the Father, speaking of Jesus Christ, said, *this is my beloved Son*, it is certain that Jesus Christ was the Son of God before God said it; and in common usage it is never said this is that, except the thing be so before it is said to be so. For example; We do not say *This is a Table*, before that, which he means by the word *this*, be a Table.

Table. Therefore it is contrary to the common stile of all Authors, as well sacred as prophane, and contrary to the common usage of all men, to make these words of Jesus Christ, *This is my Body*, to signifie the substantial conversion of the Bread into Christs Body, and the real presence of his Body in the Host immediately after the pronouncing of them by the Priest, and not before. Seeing then that Jesus Christ, when he said, *This is my Body*, did not speak contrary to the common usage of all the World, and did not take the words otherwise than all other men do, it necessarily follows that these words of Jesus Christ, *This is my Body*, do not signifie the substantial conversion of the Bread into Christs Body, nor the real presence of Christs Body in the Host immediately after the Priest hath pronounced them, and not before. And this being so, the *Romish* Doctors must seek some other passages of Scripture, than this, *This is my Body*, to prove such a conversion, and such a presence: and seeing they can find none, I conclude that such a conversion, and such a presence, have no foundation in holy Scripture.

2. That which I have said concerning common usage is founded on this reason, *viz.* because things must be before there can be any Image, Picture, or Representation of

them, and consequently Images are after the things, whereof they are Images : But words are the Images of conceptions, and conceptions the Images of things : Therefore things are such before we can really conceive them to be such, and we conceive them to be such, before we can say they are such. Therefore that which Jesus Christ held, and gave to his Disciples, expressed by the word *this*, was his body, before he conceived that it was his body, and he conceived that it was his body, before he said *This is my Body*; and consequently it is not by vertue of these words, *This is my Body*, that that which Jesus Christ gave to his Disciples, expressed by the word *this*, was his Body; but rather it is by blessing the bread, or thanksgiving, that the bread was made the Body of Christ, because it was made the Sacrament of it. Whence it follows that these words, *this is my body*, must be expounded thus, *this bread is my body*; and these words, *this bread is my body*, must be expounded thus, *this bread is the Sacrament of my body*; which I prove thus :

3. A Proposition must be expounded according to the nature of the thing in question; for example, If a man, pointing at the King's Person, should say, *this is the King*, the
Pro-

Proposition must be expounded thus, *this is the King's Person*, because the King's Person is meant; But if a man coming into a Painter's Shop, and pointing at the King's Picture, should say, *this is the King*, the Proposition must be expounded thus, *this is the King's Picture*; because here his Picture is meant. Even so if Jesus Christ laying his hand on his Breast, had said this is my Body, we must without doubt have understood the Proposition concerning his real Body: and not concerning the Sign, or Sacrament of it, because his very Body had been then meant, and not the Sign or Sacrament of it: But Jesus Christ, being about to institute the Eucharist, and to that end, having taken bread, blessed it, and given it to his Disciples with these words, *Take eat, this is my Body*, it is evident that they must be understood of the Sacrament of his Body, and the proposition must be understood thus, *this is the Sacrament of my Body*, because here the Sacrament of his Body is meant, And seeing a Sacrament is a visible sign of an invisible grace, as the Council of Trent saith, in its sixth Session, it is evident that this proposition, *this is my Body*, being expounded by this, *this is the Sacrament of my Body*, may be expounded thus, *this is the sign of my Body*; which I confirm thus:

4. In these two Propositions, *This is my body*, *This cup is the New Testament in my blood*, the word [*is*] must be taken in the same sense, because they are alike, having been pronounced upon the same matter, viz. the one upon one part of the Sacrament, and the other upon the other part of it; and because of like things we must give a like Judgment. But in this Proposition, *this cup is the New Testament*, the word [*is*] is not taken for a real and transubstantiated being; but for a Sacramental and significative being; because neither the cup, nor that which is in the cup, is changed into a Testament; neither is it really and properly a Testament, but the Sacrament of the New Testament. Therefore in this Proposition likewise, *this is my body*, the word [*is*] is not taken for a real and transubstantiated being; but for a Sacramental and significative being: and consequently as this Proposition, *this cup is the New Testament*, must be expounded thus; the Wine that is in the cup is the sign and Sacrament of the New Testament: So this Proposition, *this is my body*, must be expounded thus, *this Bread is the Sign and Sacrament of my Body*. Whence it follows, that in one single Proposition of Jesus Christ in the institution of the Sacrament of the Eucharist, viz. *this cup*

in the New Testament, there are two figures, one in the word *Cup*, being taken for that which is in the cup; this is a figure called a *Metonymie*, whereby the thing containing is taken for the thing contained. The other Figure is, that the cup is called the New Testament: this also is a Figure called a *Metonymie*, whereby the sign is called by the name of the thing signified. And therefore the *Romish* Doctors are mistaken when they tell us that all that Jesus Christ said when he instituted the Eucharist, must be taken literally and without a figure. But wisthah we must not imagine that Jesus Christ spoke obscurely, because he spoke figuratively, these figures and manners of speech, being commonly and familiarly used by all the World.

5. But when we say that these words, *this is my body, this is my blood*, must be expounded thus, this Bread is the Sign and Sacrament of my Body, this Wine is the Sign and Sacrament of my Blood, we do not mean that the Bread and Wine are barely and simply signs of Christs Body and Blood; but we believe that the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist are signs that do exhibit the body and blood of Christ to believers: For when they do, by the mouth of the body receive the Bread and Wine of the Eucharist, they do at the

the same time, by the mouth of the soul, viz by Faith, receive the Body of Christ broken, and his Blood shed for the remission of their sins, as will be proved in the next Chapter.

6. Add hereunto this one Argument. When a man saith that a thing is such, if it be not such, during the whole time, which he employs in saying it is such, he makes a false proposition. For Example, When a man saith that a Wall is white, if it be not white during the whole time he employs in saying it is white, he makes a false proposition. But (according to the *Romish* Doctors) when Jesus Christ said, *this is my Body*: it was not his body during the whole time which he employed in saying *this is my body*: for, they say, it was his body afterward only: Therefore, according to the *Romish* Doctors, Jesus Christ uttered a false proposition: which being blasphemous to affirm, we must lay down this for a foundation, that that which Jesus Christ gave his Disciples, when he said, *this is my body*, was his body, not only after he had said it, but also while he was saying it, and before he said it. And here we have this advantage of those of the *Romish* Church, that who believe the truth of these words of Jesus Christ, *this is my body*, much better then the

do; because they believe it at one time only,
viz. after he had said it: but we believe it at
 three several times, *viz.* before he said it,
 when he was saying it, and after he had said
 it. But here some may object that we must
 not take these words of our Lord in too rigo-
 rous a sense, and that in these words, *this is*
my body, we must take the present tense for
 the next future, and then the sense will be
 this, this will immediately be my body. To
 which I answer, that the *Romish* Doctors will
 have us take these words, *this is my body*, in
 the rigour of the literal sense, and then the
 proposition is evidently false. I know that
 the Present tense may be taken for the next
 Future, as when Jesus Christ said, *I go to my*
Father, and to your Father; I go to my God, and
to your God: that is, I shall go speedily. But
 who can be so bold and ignorant as to affirm
 that this speech is without a Figure, seeing
 all Grammarians know that it is a Figure cal-
 led *Enallage* of time? Therefore the *Romish*
 Doctors must confess, that by their own do-
 ctrine this proposition of Jesus Christ, *this is*
my body, is either false or figurative; and that
 seeing it is not false, it must be figurative, and
 that the figure must be a *Metonymie*, whereby
 the sign takes the name of the thing signified
 (as hath already been proved) and not an *E-*
nallage of time.

C H A P. II.

Concerning the Exposition of these words

*He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood
hath eternal life. My flesh is meat indeed
&c.*

1. **I**N this Chapter I shall prove that Jesus Christ speaks of a spiritual eating and drinking by Faith, and not of a corporeal eating and drinking by the mouth of the body. My first Argument is this: When a man would satisfy his hunger, and quench his thirst, he eateth, and drinketh that thing which he hungers and thirsts after; because eating satisfieth hunger, and drinking quencheth thirst: But it is by Faith, that is by believing in Jesus Christ, that we satisfy the hunger, and quench the thirst which we have after Christ, for it is in the sixth of St. John, *He that cometh to me shall never hunger, and he that believeth in me shall never thirst*: Therefore it is by Faith or by believing, that we eat and drink Jesus Christ, and consequently the eating of Christs flesh and drinking his blood is spiritual, and not corporal.

2. My

2. My second Argument is this: Jesus Christ saith, *He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood hath eternal life.* And except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you, John 6. But it is the spiritual eating and drinking by Faith that gives life eternal, and not the corporal eating and drinking by the mouth of the body; because many Reprobates (according to the very doctrine of Rome it self) do corporally eat the flesh and drink the blood of Christ, and yet shall not inherit eternal life.

3. The third Argument is taken from St. Augustine, and Cardinal Cajetan, who expound the words of Jesus Christ as we do. St. Augustin in Book 3. of *Christian Doctrine*, speaketh thus, *To eat the flesh of Christ is a figure, teaching us to partake of Christs Passion, and to imprint in our memories with delight and profit, that Christ was crucified for us.* Card. Cajetan in his Commentary on St. John 6. saith, *To eat the flesh of Christ, and drink his blood, is faith in Christs death; so that the sense of this, if you use not the death of the Son of man for meat and drink, ye shall not have the life of the Spirit in you.* And having sufficiently proved his Exposition, he adds: *To eat and drink the Sacrament is a thing common, as well to those*

those that eat unworthily, as to those that eat worthily; but that which Jesus Christ here speaks of, is not common to both, for he saith, *he that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood hath eternal Life*; he saith not he that eateth unworthily and drinketh worthily, but he that eateth and drinketh. Whence it clearly appears that according to the Letter, he speaks not of eating and drinking the Sacrament of the Eucharist, but of eating and drinking of the death of Jesus Christ.

4. Now that we may clearly understand this doctrine, we must consider, wherein the life which Jesus Christ gives us, doth consist; for seeing the flesh of Jesus Christ is meat to us because it gives us life; it is evident that if we know what life that is which Jesus Christ gives us, we must know likewise how Jesus Christ is meat to us, and consequently how we eat him. But to know what that life is which Jesus Christ gives us, we must consider what that death is in which we were involved, which is expressed by St. Paul, *Ephes. 2* in these words: *When we are dead in sins and trespasses God hath quickned us together with Christ: by grace ye are saved*, and consequently the death in which we were involved, consists in two things, first in the curse of the Law, which imports the privation

on of felicity, and the suffering of temporal and eternal punishment for our Sins. Secondly it consists in an habitual corruption, whereby sin reigns in us; and therefore it is said *1 Tim. 5. The widow that lives in pleasure is dead while she liveth.* Also sins are called *dead works, Heb. 10.* So that the life which Jesus Christ hath purchased for us, consists in two things. First, in deliverance from the curse of the Law by the pardon of our sins, as St. Paul tells us *Coloss. 2. God hath quickned you together with Christ, having forgiven you all trespasses, blotting out the obligation that was against us; which obligation proceeded from the Law, because it did oblige all the transgressors of it to a curse.* Secondly, It consists in regeneration, or sanctification, whereof Jesus Christ speaking in *John 3.* saith, *Except a man be born again he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God:* and St. Paul, *Heb. 12. Without holiness no man shall see the Lord.* Therefore seeing that the life which Jesus Christ hath purchased for us, consists in the pardon of our sins, and in our regeneration, and sanctification, which ends in glorification; and that Jesus Christ is called meat in reference to this life, we must consider the means, whereby Jesus Christ hath purchased these things for us; and seeing it

is

is certain, that his death is the means by which he hath purchased pardon of sins, and regeneration, we must conclude, that Jesus Christ is the food and nourishment of our souls in regard of the merit of his death. But that Jesus Christ by his death hath purchased life for us, (that is justification, which consists in the pardon of our sins, and regeneration, which consists in holiness of life) appears by these passages of Scripture; viz. *We are justified by the blood of Christ, and reconciled to God by his Death. Rom. 5. We have redemption by his blood, even the remission of sins. Ephes. 1. He hath reconciled us in the body of his flesh by his death, that he may present us holy, without spot, and blameless in his sight. Coll. 1. We are sanctified by the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all, Heb. 10. Christ loved the Church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctifie and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, that he might present it unto himself a glorious Church, &c. Eph. 5. Therefore seeing Jesus Christ hath purchased life for us by his death, and that his flesh and blood are our meat and drink (because they purchased life eternal for us on the Cross, viz. the remission of our sins, and sanctification, ending in glorification) it follows that the action whereby Jesus Christ is applied to us*
for

for righteousness, and sanctification, is the same by which we eat the flesh of Christ, and drink his Blood. But this action is nothing else but Faith, as the Scripture tells us: *Being justified by faith we have peace with God*, Rom. 5. *God purifies our hearts by faith*. Act. 15. *He that believeth hath eternal life*, John 6. From what hath been said I form this Argument. That Action whereby we obtain remission of sins, and sanctification, ending in glorification, is the same, whereby we have that life, which Jesus Christ hath purchased for us by his death; because that life principally consists in the remission of sins, and sanctification, as we have proved. But the spiritual eating, and drinking by faith and not the corporal by the mouth, is that action, whereby we obtain remission of sins, and sanctification, as we have also proved. Therefore the spiritual eating and drinking by faith is the action, whereby we have that life, which Jesus Christ hath purchased for us by his death, and not the corporal eating and drinking by the mouth. And consequently seeing in St. John 6. a certain eating and drinking is spoken of, whereby we have that life which Jesus Christ hath purchased for us by his death; it is evident that a spiritual eating and drinking is there spoken of, and not a corporal.

5. From what hath been said it appears, that when Jesus Christ saith, *my flesh is meat indeed*, &c. the figure falls upon the word *meat*, which is taken not for corporal but spiritual meat. The reason whereof is, that corporal food is that which is appointed for the nourishment of the body, as spiritual food is that which is appointed for the nourishment of the soul; so that although corporal food be taken by the mouth of the body, yet that only doth not make it to be corporal food, except it be taken for the nourishment of the body; otherwise poison, medicine, a bullet, &c. which a man should swallow would be corporal food; which is absurd to affirm. But the flesh of Christ, which is pretended to be eaten in the Eucharist by the mouth of the body, is not appointed for the nourishment of the body; because that food which is appointed for the nourishment of the body is changed into the substance of the body: but the body of Christ is not changed into the substance of our bodies: Therefore the flesh of Christ is not a corporal food, but his flesh broken, and his blood shed on the Cross, is a spiritual food which nourisheth the souls of those, who by a true and lively faith, do embrace this flesh broken, and this blood shed; that is, who do wholly rest and rely on

in the merit of his death and passion for obtaining mercy from God. And certainly, being that the life which Jesus Christ gives us by his death, is spiritual, that the nourishment is spiritual, that the eating his Body and drinking his Blood, is spiritual (as hath been proved) it follows that his flesh must be spiritual meat, and his blood spiritual drink. And this flesh of Christ is incomparably better, and more truly meat indeed in regard of its effects, than corporal food can be, because it doth better, and more perfectly nourish the souls of Believers than corporal food doth their bodies; this being corruptible food which gives temporal life only; but that spiritual and incorruptible food which gives life eternal.

6. I conclude this Chapter with this consideration. When a doctrine is proposed which is pretended to be divine, and that passages of holy Scripture are alledged for the proof of it, if it opposeth, or seems to oppose sense and reason, and to include contradictions; and that a more suitable and rational sense can be found out for those passages, so that all these inconveniences and contradictions may be avoided; there is nothing more just than that we should embrace that probable and rational sense, and reject

reject that doctrine which opposeth sense and reason, and seems to imply contradictions: But the doctrine of the real presence of the Manhood of Jesus Christ in the Host, and the Transubstantiation of the Bread into his Body, is repugnant to sense and reason, and seems to include divers contradictions; (*viz.* that a humane body is in a point without any local extension, that a body may be in divers places at one and the same time, that the Bread and Wine are changed into the Body and Blood of Christ, which were before; that accidents may be without a subject, &c.) And the passages that are impertinently alledged to prove such a presence, and such a change, have a sense very commodious and rational, for the avoiding all these contradictions, as appears in this and the former Chapter, where I have very rationally expounded those two passages which the *Romish* Doctors impertinently make use of for this subject. Therefore they ought to embrace that commodious and rational sense which we have given them; and to reject the doctrine of the real presence of the Body of Jesus Christ in the Host, and the doctrine of Transubstantiation.

CHAP. III.

Against Transubstantiation.

I. **T**Ransubstantiation is the substantial conversion of the Bread and Wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, which I destroy by divers Arguments; the first whereof is this:

In every substantial conversion, that thing into which another thing is converted, is always newly produced. For Example, when seed is converted into an Animal, that Animal is newly produced; when Jesus Christ turned the water into wine, the wine was newly produced, &c. But the Body and Blood of Christ cannot be newly produced in the Sacrament of the Eucharist: Therefore the Bread and Wine are not substantially converted into the Body and Blood of Christ in the Sacrament of the Eucharist. The second Proposition, *viz.* that the Body and Blood of Christ cannot be newly produced, I prove thus: That which is newly produced receives a new being; because to produce a thing, and to give it a being is one and the same: But the Body and Blood of Christ cannot receive a new being, which I

B

prove

u,

prove thus : A man cannot receive that which he hath, while he hath it, and therefore he cannot receive a being while he hath a being ; for as it is impossible to take away a being from that which hath no being ; so it is impossible to give a being to that which hath a being already : and as you cannot kill a dead man, so you cannot give life to one that is living. But the Body and Blood of Christ have, and always will have a being : Therefore they cannot receive one, and consequently cannot be reproduced in the Eucharist.

2. My second Argument is this. In every substantial conversion, that thing which is converted into another is destroyed. For example, When the water was turned into wine, the water was destroyed : But in the Sacrament of the Eucharist the Bread and Wine are not destroyed by the Consecration ; which I prove thus : In the celebration of the Eucharist there is breaking, giving, eating and drinking after the consecration, as appears by the very practice of our Adversaries, who after consecration, break the Host, and divide it into three parts, give nothing to the Communicants but consecrated Hosts, and eat and drink nothing but what was consecrated : But the
Scripture

scripture saith, that in the celebration of the Eucharist, Bread is broken, that Bread and Wine are given, and that Bread is eaten and Wine drank, as appears by these following passages. St. Paul, 1 Cor. 10. saith, *The bread which we break is it not the communion of the body of Christ?* and 1 Cor. 11. Saint Matth. 26. St. Mark 14. and St. Luke 22, it is said that *Jesus Christ took bread, brake it, and gave it;* and St. Mark 14. and St. Matth. 26. Jesus Christ after he had participated of the Sacrament of the Eucharist, saith, *I will drink no more of this fruit of the Vine:* and 1 Cor. 11. *As often as ye eat this bread and drink this Cup. Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that Cup.*

3. Secondly, When Jesus Christ said to his Disciples, *Drink ye all of this,* St. Matth. 26. that is, drink ye all of this Cup, either he commanded to drink of a Cup of Wine or of a Cup of Blood: if he commanded them to drink of a Cup of Wine, then it follows that they drank nothing but Wine, because it is certain that they obeyed Jesus Christ; for it is said St. Mark 14. that *they all drank of it.* Or if he commanded them to drink of a Cup of Blood, then it follows that the Wine was already changed into his

Blood, because it is not probable that Jesus Christ said to them, Drink ye all of this cup of Blood, and yet that it was not a cup of Blood, but a cup of Wine. But when Jesus Christ said, *Drink ye all of this*, he did not speak to them of a cup of Blood, for the Wine was not then converted into Christ's Blood, because (according to our Adversaries) it was not changed until Jesus Christ had made an end of uttering these following words, *for this is my Blood*. But, he uttered these words, *Drink ye all of this*, before he uttered those, *for this is my Blood*, because a man must utter a Proposition before he can give the reason of it.

4. Thirdly, When a thing is converted into another, we cannot see the effects and properties of the thing converted, but only of that into which it is converted. For Example, When the seed is changed into an Animal we can see no more the effects and properties of the seed, but of the Animal only; and when Jesus Christ turned the Water into Wine, the effects, properties, accidents of the Water were no more seen, but of the Wine only, &c. But in the Eucharist we cannot, after the consecration, perceive the effects, properties, accidents, or parts of the Body and Blood of Christ;

Christ; but we see there all the effects, properties, and accidents of Bread and Wine: Therefore in the Eucharist, the Bread and Wine are not converted into the Body and Blood of Christ. And the truth is, if that which appears to be Bread, and hath all the effects, accidents, and properties of Bread, be not Bread, but Christ's Body clothed with the accidents of Bread; then it may likewise be said that they that appear to be men, and have all the effects, properties, and accidents of men, are not men, but horses clothed with the accidents of men.

5. The fourth Argument is this. In every substantial conversion there must be a subject to pass from one substance to another; for then it would be a Creation, which is the sole action that doth not pre-suppose a subject. But in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, after the consecration, there is no subject; because, according to our Adversaries, there remains no subject; for, as they assert the accidents of Bread and Wine remain without any subject at all: Therefore in the Sacrament of the Eucharist there is no substantial conversion.

6. The fifth Argument is drawn from hence, That Transubstantiation destroys the

nature of accidents, thus. That doctrine
 which asserts that accidents are not accidents
 but substances, destroys the nature and es-
 sence of accidents, because it is impossible
 that an accident can be a substance. But the
 doctrine of Transubstantiation asserts that
 accidents are not accidents, but that they
 are substances, which I prove thus. That
 doctrine which asserts that accidents are not
 inherent, but that they subsist of themselves
 doth assert that accidents are not accidents
 but that they are substances, because inher-
 ent is the essential difference of an accident
 and subsistence. But the doctrine of Tran-
 substantiation asserts that accidents are not
 inherent, but that they subsist, which I
 prove thus. That doctrine which asserts
 that accidents may be without a subject
 doth assert that accidents are not inherent
 in a subject, but that they subsist by them-
 selves: But the doctrine of Transubstantia-
 tion asserts that accidents may be without a
 subject, viz. the accidents of Bread and
 Wine without any substance, and without
 any subject to sustain them; for by Tran-
 substantiation the substance of the Bread and
 Wine is gone, and their accidents remain.
 Therefore the doctrine of Transubstantiation
 asserts that accidents are not inherent, but

do subsist by themselves, and consequently asserts that accidents are not accidents, but substances, and so destroys the nature and essence of accidents. But here it may be said that actual inheritance doth not constitute an accident, but aptitudinal only. Against which I form this Argument. Whatsoever doth exist actually, either it exists in something else actually, so that it cannot be without it; which Philosophers call actual inherence, as walking: or else it exists in and by it self actually, so that it may be alone by it self, which Philosophers term *actual existence*; the former of these constitutes an accident, and the latter constitutes a substance. But the accidents of the Bread and Wine, after consecration, do exist actually: Therefore they must exist either in something else actually, or in themselves actually. But they do not exist in and by themselves actually, for else they would subsist by themselves and be real substances, which is impossible: Therefore they exist in something else actually, *viz.* in the substance of the Bread and Wine, and consequently the substance of the Bread and Wine remains after the Consecration, and so there can be no Transubstantiation.

7. The sixth Argument is drawn from

this, that Transubstantiation destroys the nature of Sacraments, because every Sacrament is a visible sign of an invisible grace, as the Council of *Trent* saith in *Sess.* 6. and every sign relates to the thing signified, so that we must speak of signs and Sacraments, as of things relating to something else. Put all relative things have, as it were, a double being, *viz.* an absolute being which is the natural being of the thing, and a relative being whereby it relates to something else. For example, In a man that hath begotten a child, we consider his absolute and natural being as he is a man as others are, and his relative being, whereby he is a Father, and is distinguished from other men that have no children, and so are not Fathers. So in the Sacrament of Baptism, the sign, *viz.* the Water, hath an absolute and natural being, *viz.* its cold and moist substance, whereby it is water as other waters are; and a relative, sacramental, and significative being, whereby it is the sign and Sacrament of Christ's Flood, and differs from other waters that are not imployed for this sacred use. Even so in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, the Bread and Wine, which are the signs, have their natural and absolute being, *viz.* their substance whereby they are Bread and Wine,

Wine, as other Bread and Wine, which we commonly use; and their relative, sacramental, and significative being, whereby they are the Sacrament and signs of the body and blood of Christ, and differ from all other bread and Wine; that is not thus employed. To this I add, that it is impossible a relative being should be without an absolute, because a relative cannot be without its Foundation. For example, it is impossible to be a Father without being a Man; to be equal without quantity, &c. And this being granted, I form my Argument thus, That which takes away the natural being from signs and Sacraments, destroys their nature and essence; because the relative and sacramental being cannot be without the absolute and natural, as hath been proved. But the doctrine of Transubstantiation destroys the natural being of the bread and Wine, which are signs and Sacraments of Christ's body and blood; for by Transubstantiations, the whole substance of the bread and Wine is destroyed; therefore the doctrine of Transubstantiation destroys the nature and essence of Sacraments.

8. To this Argument our Adversaries answer, That in the Eucharist the bread and Wine are not signs, because by the consecration they are destroyed as to their substance.

stance. But some of them say that the signs are the accidents of the Bread and Wine; others say that the Body and Blood of Christ contained under the accidents of the Bread and Wine, are the signs of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ crucified; Lastly, others say, that neither the accidents of the Bread and Wine only, nor the Body and Blood of Christ only, but the Body and Blood of Christ, together with the accidents of the Bread and Wine, are the signs of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ crucified: Therefore seeing the doctrine of Transubstantiation doth not destroy the natural being of Christ's Body and Blood, nor the natural being of the accidents of the Bread and Wine, they maintain that the doctrine of Transubstantiation doth not destroy the nature and essence of Sacraments.

9. To this I reply, That neither the accidents of the Bread and Wine only, nor the Body and Blood of Christ only, nor the Body and Blood of Christ together with the accidents of the Bread and Wine are the true signs of Jesus Christ crucified; but the Bread and Wine only, which I prove thus:

First, In Sacraments there ought to be an analogy and similitude between the sign, and the

the thing signified, as our Adversaries confess, and particularly Card. Bellarmin, Book 1. of the *Sacrament*, chap. 9. in these words. *The fourth thing required in a Sacrament, is that the sign should have some similitude and analogy with the thing signified.* And he quotes St. Augustine in Epist. 22. to Boniface, speaking thus: *If Sacraments had not some similitude of the things whereof they are Sacraments they could be no Sacraments:* But in the Sacraments of the Eucharist, neither the accidents of the Bread and Wine, nor the Body and Blood of Christ, whether jointly or severally, have that similitude and analogy to the thing signified which is required, but only the Bread and Wine in substance; because that which is principally signified, and represented by the signs in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, is the nourishment of our souls, in the hope of eternal life: for as Baptism is the Sacrament of our Regeneration and spiritual birth, so the Eucharist is the Sacrament of our spiritual nourishment, as Card. Belarmin confesseth in Book 3. of the *Eucharist*, chap. 9. and in Book 4. chap. 19. he saith, *that the Sacrament of the Eucharist was ordained to preserve spiritual life, which cannot be represented and signified, but by signs which can nourish our bodies; for the analogy and similitude*

tude

tude consists in this, that as the signs have over-
 vertue to nourish our Bodies for the prefer- he a
 vation of temporal life ; so the things signi- not
 fied, have a vertue to nourish our souls in- ures
 the hope of eternal life. But neither the ac- The
 cidents of the Bread and Wine, nor the Win
 Body and Blood of Christ, whether severally har
 or joyntly with the accidents, can nourish our T
 bodies, (nourishment being essentially the n in
 conversion of aliment into the substance of a ines
 living body) and it is certain that neither if t
 the accidents of Bread and Wine, nor the ble
 Body and Blood of Christ, whether separat- and
 ly, or joyntly with them, can be converted I
 into our substance, but only the substance of gn
 Bread and Wine, and other aliments which ion
 we take: Therefore neither the accidents of ec
 the Bread and Wine, nor the Body and ue
 Blood of Christ, whether separately, or nin
 jointly with them are the true signs; but Chr
 the Bread and Wine only, which being the he
 ordinary nourishment of our bodies, do gn
 represent to us the spiritual nourishment of as
 our souls by the Body and Blood of Christ, im
 received by Faith. bev
 o d
 Chr
 not
 inn

10. Secondly, The Council of *Trent* in
Session 13. commands that the Sacrament of
 the Eucharist shall be adored with *Latrie*,
 which according to our Adversaries, is the
 sovereign

sovereign worship due to God only. But the accidents of the Bread and Wine ought not to be adored, Because they are creatures, and that God only must be adored : Therefore the accidents of the bread and Wine are not the Sacrament of the Eucharist.

Thirdly, A Sacrament is a visible sign of an invisible grace, as the Council of *Trent* defines it in *Sessions* 6. and 13. Put in the *Eucharist* the Body and Blood of Christ are not visible : Therefore, in the Eucharist the body and blood of Christ, are not the signs.

Lastly, I say, that in every Sacrament the sign relates to the thing signified ; and Relation is always between two different things ; because nothing relates to it self, and consequently nothing can be both the sign and thing signified. But the body and blood of Christ are the things signified : Therefore the Body and Blood of Christ are not the signs. And it is to no purpose to say that Jesus Christ in the Mass is the sign and figure of himself on the Cross ; for Jesus Christ where-ever he is, is one and the same yesterday, to day, and for ever. And therefore Jesus Christ not being different from himself, cannot be relative to himself, nor the sign of himself.

Other

Other reasons, which are usually alledge against Transubstantiation will be more properly mentioned in the next Chapter.

C H A P. IV.

Against the real presence of Christ's Body in the Host, or consecrated Wafer.

1. **T**HE Romish Doctors affirm, That immediately after the Priest in the celebration of the Mass, hath pronounced these words, *this is my body*, the body of Christ is really present in the Host, and that it is whole and entire in every part and point of the Host; which Doctrine I destroy by these following Arguments, the first whereof is this.

2. If a thing be created in a place, either it must be produced there, or it must come, or be brought thither from some other place; for it is impossible to find out a third way of putting any thing in a place. And the Romish Doctors have hitherto been unable to invent but one of these two ways of putting Christ's Body in the Host, the *Jacobins* telling us that it is brought thither

ner from some other place, and the *Jesuites* that it is produced there. But the body of Christ can neither come, nor be brought thither into the Host, nor can it be produced here, therefore the body Christ is not in the Host.

3. First, the body of Christ cannot come, or be brought into the Host from any other place, because it can come from no place but Heaven, being no where but in Heaven. But Christ's Body neither comes, nor is brought from Heaven into the Host; which I prove thus: When a body comes, or is carried from one place to another, it must leave its first place. For Example, if a Man would go from *Paris* to *Rome*, he must leave *Paris*: But the body of Jesus Christ never leaves Heaven; for *the Heavens must contain him until the time of the Restitution of all things*, Acts 3. Therefore Christ's body neither comes, nor is brought from Heaven into the Host. Besides, it is impossible that Christ's body should come or be brought into the Host, without passing through the space that is between Heaven and Earth, where the consecrated Hosts are; because a man cannot pass from one extreame to another without passing through the space that is between them. But the space between Heaven and Earth

Earth is too vast to be passed through in a moment (for these Doctors will have it, that immediately after the pronouncing of these words, *this is my body*, the body of Christ is brought into the Host). Moreover it must in a moment be in all the Heavens, and in all the Airs between the highest Heavens, and this Earth where the Hosts are, (because a man cannot pass through a place without being there) and then it would have three sorts of Existence at once, *viz.* one natural and glorious existence in Heaven, one sacramental existence in the Host, and one airy existence in the Air. But seeing all these things are absurd we must conclude that Christ's body neither comes, nor is brought into the Host.

4. Secondly, Christ's body cannot be reproduced in the consecrated Host, because a thing that is produced already, cannot be produced again, without a preceding destruction; for as a dead man cannot be killed, nor that be annihilated, which is already annihilated already; so neither can that be produced which is produced already, nor that receive a being which hath one already. This common conception of all men is founded upon this principle, That every action

tion, whether it produceth or destroyeth
 thing, must necessarily have two distinct
 terms, the one called in the Schools, *terminus*
quo, that is, the term from which the thing
 comes, and the other *terminus ad quem*, that
 is, the term to which it comes. But accor-
 ding to this principle, that cannot be annihi-
 lated which is so already, nor that receive a
 being which hath one already; because the
 term from which it should come, and the
 term to which it should come, would be one
 and the same thing; contrary to the Maxim
 already laid down, *viz.* that the terms of acti-
 on must necessarily be distinct, and that one
 of them must be the negation or privation of
 the other.

5. Here perhaps it may be objected, That
 by Transubstantiation the substance of
 Christ's Body is not newly produced, but
 only a new presence of him in the place
 where the substance of the bread was. But
 to this I answer, That in all substantial
 conversions and actions, a new substance
 must be produced, as in accidental, a new
 accident must be produced. But Tran-
 substantiation (according to the *Romish* Do-
 ctors) is a substantial conversion: There-
 fore by Transubstantiation a new substance
 must be produced. And seeing that the
 new

new presence of Christ's body in the place where the substance of the bread was, made not a substance, but an accident of the *Category*, which the Philosophers call *Ubiquitatem*. it is evident that by Transubstantiation the presence of Christ's Body only is not produced in the place where the substance of the Bread was; and seeing that the substance of Christ's body is not produced there (as hath been proved in the preceeding number) we must conclude that there is no Transubstantiation nor real presence of Christ's Body in the Host. This instance doth also destroy the adduction of Christ's Body into the Host, which hath been already refuted in number 3.

6. My second Argument is this. In a true and humane body such as Christ's body is, there is something above, and something under, to the right and left, before and behind; for the head is above the neck, and the neck above the shoulders, the shoulders above the breast; the breast above the stomach, the stomach above the belly, the belly above the thighs, the thighs above the legs, &c. But all the World knows that in a point there is nothing above or under, right or left, before or behind: Therefore Christ's body is not in a point, and consequently it is not

in every point, or part of the Host. To this add, that the quantity and greatness of Christ's body is nothing else but its length, breadth, and thickness, which cannot be in a point. Lastly, The quantity of Christ's body is nothing else but its extent, as we all know; and a body is extended when it hath its parts one without another; that is, they are not one within another, as all the *Jesuites* expound it. But the doctrine of the presence of Christ's body in the Host, puts all its parts one within another, because it puts them all in a point: Therefore such a doctrine takes away its extent, and consequently its quantity.

7. My third Argument is this. To move, and not to move at the same time, to be eaten and not to be eaten at the same time, to be in a point and not in a point at the same time, to occupy a place and not to occupy it at the same time, are contradictory things. But if the Body of Christ were in divers consecrated Hosts, it would move and not move at the same time. For example, When a Priest carries a consecrated Host to a sick Person, the body of Christ which is pretended to be in it, moves with the Host; for it leaves the Altar, and goes with the Priest toward the sick Person's house

house, and at the same time the body of Christ, which is pretended to be in the other Hosts that remain on the Altar, move not; and so the same body of Christ at the same time moves and moves not, which is a contradiction. Seeing then it is impossible that one and the same body at one and the same time should move and not move, it is likewise impossible that Christ's body should be in divers Hosts at the same time. In like manner, if Christ's body were at the same time in Heaven, and in the Host it would be eaten and not eaten at the same time; for it would be eaten in the Host by the Priest, and at the same time it would not be eaten in Heaven. Also it would be in a point and not in a point at the same time; for in the Host it would be in a point, and in Heaven it would not be in a point at the same time; Therefore seeing it is impossible that one and the same body at one and the same time should be eaten and not eaten, should be in a point and not in a point; it is also impossible that Christ's body should be both in Heaven and in the Host at the same time.

8. The fourth Argument is this: Two Relatives are always different, as the Father and Son, the Husband and the Wife,

And relation is always between two things that really differ ; as the equality between two Ells, the resemblance between two Crows, &c. In a word, nothing can have relation to it self, but whatsoever hath relation must necessarily have it to something else, as appears by the definition of Relation: But to be distant is a relative and not an absolute term ; for when we conceive an absolute term we conceive but one thing, as when we conceive a Crow ; but when we conceive a relative term, we necessarily conceive two things. For example, We cannot conceive a Crow to be like, without conceiving something else to which it is like, Seeing then we cannot conceive a thing to be distant without conceiving something else from which it is distant, it is evident that to be distant is a relative term, and that distant things are relatives, and consequently are really different. Whence I form this Argument: Relative things are really different, as hath been proved : But the body that is at *Rome* is distant from that which is at *Paris*, by reason of the space of about 300 Leagues that is between those two Cities ; and the body that is in the highest heavens, is distant from that which is upon earth, by reason

reason of the many thousands of Leagues that are between Heaven and Earth: Therefore the body that is at *Rome* is different from that which is at *Paris*, and that which is in Heaven, is different from that which is upon Earth; and consequently one and the same body cannot be at the same time at *Rome* and at *Paris*, in Heaven and upon Earth; else one and the same body might be distant and different from it self, which is a contradiction: Therefore seeing Jesus Christ is not distant, and different from himself it follows that he cannot be at the same time in Heaven and in the Host, nor at the same time in the consecrated Hosts at *Rome*, and at *Paris*.

9. But perhaps it may be said that a body being at the same time in two distant places is not distant from it self, but that the places only are distant; and therefore that Christ's body in heaven is not distant from it self in the Host, but it is the places only, *viz.* Heaven and Earth (where the Host is) that are distant. To this I answer, that it is only the distance of places that makes the distance of things existing in those distant places. For Example: The reason why *Peter* that is at *Rome*, is distant from *Paul* that is at *Paris*, is not because they are two things really different,

t, else they would be always distant, e-
 n when they are in one Bed together,
 or they are always really different) but
 the reason of their distance is, because
 they are in two distant places. Seeing then
 according to our Adversaries) that Christ's
 body is in two distant places at once, viz.
 in Heaven and in the Host at *Rome* and at
Paris in divers Hosts, it follows that Christ's
 body is distant, and different from it self.
 And seeing it is impossible that it should be
 distant and different from it self, it is evi-
 dent that it cannot be in two distant places
 at once; and consequently not in Heaven
 and in the Host.

10. Besides, Suppose that *Peter* could be at
Rome and at *Paris* at once, and that *Peter* that
 is at *Rome* should have a mind to go to *Pa-*
ris, and should go accordingly, and that the
 same *Peter* that is at *Paris* should have a
 mind to go to *Rome*, and should go ac-
 cordingly, it is certain that *Peter* would draw
 near to himself, and meet himself. But
 things that draw near to each other, must
 necessarily have been at a distance before;
 and therefore if a Body draws near to it
 self, it is certain that it was distant from
 it self before. And hereupon I would
 ask our Adversaries, whether, when
Peter

Peter should meet himself, he would let himself pass, or not ? and if he should let himself pass, whether *Peter* going to *Rome*, would step aside and give way to himself going to *Paris*, or else the contrary ? But if he should not step aside and give place to himself, I would ask, whether he would hinder himself from passing or not ? and if he should not hinder himself from passing, whether he would pass thorow himself, and so make another *Janus* with two faces, &c ? Whatsoever answers they shall make to these Questions must (I am sure) be very absurd and ridiculous.

II. The fifth Argument is this : It is a perfect contradiction, that a body should be one and not one : But if Christ's Body should be at the same time in the Heaven, and upon Earth in the Host, it would be one and not one ; for it would be one by our Adversaries own confession, and it would not be one ; which I prove thus : That a thing may be one, it must neither be divided in it self, nor from it self, as appears by the definition of Unity ; and it is certain that nothing is divided or separated from it self : But if Christ's Body be at the same time in heaven and upon earth in the Host, it will be divided, and separated from

it self, that which is in heaven being divided and separated from that which is upon earth, because it is not in the space between both.

12. Here again it may be objected, That a body in divers places is divided from it self locally, because the places in which it is, are divided; but not entitatively, because it is still one and the same entity of body. To which I answer, 1. That entitative division (which is nothing else but a plurality of beings, or a plurality of things really different) is no true division, for then the three divine Persons which are really different, would also be really divided; and the body and soul of a living man which do really differ, would also be really divided. 2. I say, That if a body be divided and separated from bodies which it toucheth, it is also divided and separated from bodies which it doth not touch; and if a body be divided and separated from bodies to which it is near, it is also divided and separated from bodies that are far distant from it; but especially the division is true, when between two there be bodies of divers natures, to which there is no union. Therefore, seeing that between Christ's body, which is really in heaven, and the

same body, which is pretendedly upon
 earth in the consecrated Hosts, there be di-
 vers bodies of divers natures, to which it
 is not united ; it is evident by our Adver-
 saries own doctrine, that Christ's Body is
 really divided and separated from it self.
 And seeing it is impossible it should be se-
 parated from it self, it is also impossible
 that it should be in Heaven, and in the
 Host at the same time. 3. I say, That
 local division takes away entitative divisi-
 on, and things that are divided locally,
 are also divided entitatively ; that is, they
 are also really different ; else no reason
 can be given why two glasses of water
 taken from the same Fountain, are really
 different, seeing these waters are like in
 all things, except in reference to place ;
 and there can no reason be given why the
 Ocean is not one single drop of water on-
 ly, reproduced in all places occupied by the
 Ocean, except it be that one drop of wa-
 ter cannot be reproduced in all those places ;
 but if it be possible, then Reason obligeth us
 to believe that it is really so, because God and
 Nature do nothing in vain ; and it is in vain
 to do that by many things, which may be
 done by one thing : and if it be really so, then
 it follows, That all the Sea battels that ever
 have

have been, were fought in one drop of water, and many thousands of men have been drowned in one drop of water, and people since *Adam* have drunk but one drop of water, which things are absurd and ridiculous.

13. The sixth Argument is this: Jesus Christ as he is a man, cannot be in divers places at once, if another man cannot be so too, because Jesus Christ, as he is man, *was made like unto us in all things, sin only excepted*, as the Apostle to the *Hebrews* observes. But another man cannot be in divers places at once; for example, *Peter* cannot be at the same time at *Paris* and at *Rome*, which I prove thus. It is impossible that *Peter* should be a man and no man at the same time: But if *Peter* could at the same time be at *Paris* and at *Rome*, he might at the same time be a man and no man, which I prove thus: He that may at the same time, be both dead and alive, may at the same time be a man and no man; because he that is alive is a real man, and he that is dead is no real man, but a carcass; But if *Peter* could at the same time be at *Paris* and at *Rome*, he might be both alive and dead at the same time; for he might be mortally wounded at *Paris* and die there, and at the same time not be hurt at *Rome*, but alive,

and making merry there. Besides, *Peter* might be divisibly at *Paris*, and indivisibly at *Rome*; (as *Christ's* body, according to our Adversaries, is divisibly in heaven, and indivisibly in the Host :) But if at *Paris* (where he should be divisibly) his head should be cut off, he would die, and cease to be a man; and at *Rome* (where he should be indivisibly and in a point) his head should not be cut off, and so he should remain at the same time a living and real man, which is a contradiction. In a word, *Peter* might be at *Paris* in the midst of flames, and be burnt and reduced to ashes, and consequently should die, and be no man; whereas at the same time he might be at *Rome* in the River *Tiber*, sound and brisk, and consequently be a true living man: whence it follows that he might be a man, and no man, which is a contradiction.

14. To this may be added other absurdities that would follow from this Position that one body may be in divers places at once viz. That one Candle lighted might give light to all the World, if it were reproduced in all places of the World: That a great Army might be made of one man, reproduced in a hundred thousand adjoining places. That all the debts in the World might be paid

paid with one Crown, reproduced as many times as there be Crowns due : That all the people in the World might quench their thirst with one Pottle of Wine, reproduced as many times as there be inhabitants in the World : That all the men in the World might drink in one and the same Glass, reproduced as many times as there be men in the World : (whereupon a man might be so curious as to ask, whether if this Glass should be broken at *Paris*, it would also be broken at *Rome*, *Constantinople*, and other places :) That one man reproduced in an hundred thousand places, might at the same time marry an hundred thousand Wives, and lie with them ; whereupon a man might desire to know whether these Women might not conceive, and every one of them be delivered of a child at the end of nine months ; and consequently it may be said that one man did in one night beget a hundred thousand children, &c.

15. The seventh Argument is this ; if Christ's body were in the Host, it would be seen there ; for being there in its glory (as the *Romish* Doctors say it is) it would be there more visibly than it was when he conversed amongst men here below ; because the glory of Christ's body doth principally consist

sist in the brightness and splendor of an extraordinary light, like to that which it had upon Mount *Tabor*; but who dares affirm that such a glorious body is not visible, where-soever it is; and yet it is certain that Christ's body is not to be seen in the Host, which is an evident sign that it is not there. But it may be said that Christ's body is under the accidents of the bread, and that these accidents hide it from us. To this I answer, that (according to our Adversaries) Christ's body is in the place where the substance of the bread was: but the substance of the bread was not under the accidents, and the accidents of the bread were not upon their substance, for then the substance of the bread and its accidents had been in two different places, above and under being two several differences of place, and that which is under is not above, &c. Therefore Christ's body cannot be under the accidents of the bread, and consequently the accidents do not hide from us. And seeing (as our Adversaries say) Christ's body is in every part and point of the Host, it must needs be in the superficies, and consequently cannot be hid or covered by the accidents of the bread. Here again it may be said that Christ's body is glorious, luminous, and visible

sible of it self, but God hinders us from seeing it. To this I answer, That if God hinders, it is only because he is pleased so to do, and consequently if he were pleased not to hinder, he would not do it, but would permit it to be seen in the same posture as it is in the Host. Whereupon I would ask our Adversaries in what posture it would be seen there, whether sitting, standing, lying, or in any other posture, or whether it would be in any posture at all? If it be in no posture, it must be without any external form, because posture or situation absolutely depends upon external form. But how can a man be seen without an external form of a man, and without being in any posture of a man? and how can Christ's body be without posture and without external form; seeing (as our Adversaries say) it is whole and entire in the whole Host, and occupies the whole space of a great Host? But if it be sitting, or standing, or in another posture, and with the external form of a man, and if (as they say) it be whole, and entire in a point of the Host, then it will follow that a man may be seen sitting, or standing in a point; and seeing a man that is standing, hath his head above and his feet below, it will follow that Jesus Christ will be seen in a point of the Host with his head above and

his feet below, though in a point there be nothing above or below. To this I add, That if it could be seen in the Host it would appear as big as the Host, because it would occupy the whole space of the Host, and it would appear round, because it would be bounded by the space that the Host occupies, which is round. Besides, if the Host should be divided into two equal parts, it would appear less by one half, and in the form of a half Circle, because it would be whole and entire in the half of the Host, and occupy the space of it. It would also appear a hundred thousand times less, and in a hundred thousand several forms; for, as they say, it is whole and entire in a hundred thousand parts of the Host, and occupies the spaces of them. In a word, There was never such a monstrous thing seen in the World, as Christ's Body would be, if it were really in the Host in such a manner, as our Adversaries affirm it to be.

16. The eighth Argument is this: Either the Manhood of Jesus Christ, which is pretended to be in the Host, can act there, or it cannot, if it cannot act, then it follows that it cannot see, hear, know, or love, or exercise any other function of the sensitive or rational Soul: But if the Manhood of Christ

in

in the Host knows nothing, nor loves nothing, then it follows that it will not be happy, because happiness chiefly consists in the knowledge and love of God. Also the Manhood of Christ in the Host will be different from his Manhood in Heaven; for it will know in Heaven, and at the same time know nothing in the Host; it will love in Heaven, and love nothing in the Host; it will see in Heaven, and see nothing in the Host. But if Christ's Manhood can act in the Host as it doth in Heaven, then it will follow that it will open its eyes, and move its feet in a point; because according to our Adversaries, it is whole and entire in every point of the Host; And seeing, as they tell us, God can as easily put the whole world into a point, as he doth the whole manhood of Christ into a point of the Host, it will follow that all parts of the world existing in a point may do in it all those actions which they now do in a vast space, as the parts of Christ's Manhood existing in a point of the Host can do in it all those actions which they do in Heaven; and so in a less space than is occupied by a grain of Corn; the Sun may move from East to West, the Sea may have its Flouds and Ebbs, and the *English* may have a Sea fight with the *Spaniards*. In a word, a Sparrow may easily swallow all the World, seeing the

World will not occupy so much space as a grain of Corn doth; and yet the World which it shall swallow, will be as great as it is at present; even as Christ's body in the Host, is as big and as tall as it was on the Cross, as our Adversaries affirm.

17. The ninth Argument is this: As a body cannot be in a place, except it be produced there, or that it comes, or be brought thither from some other place; so a body cannot cease to be in a place without being destroyed, or going to some other place; and consequently if Christ's body ceaseth to be in the Host after the Consumption of the accidents, it must necessarily either perish, or go to some other place: but Christ's body cannot perish, for *Iesus Christ dieth no more*, Rom. 6. And Christ's body goes to no other place, for if it should go to any other place, it would go to Heaven; but it cannot go to Heaven, because it is there already, and a man cannot go to a place where he is already: Therefore Christ's body doth not cease to be in the Host. Whence it follows, that either Christ's body still remains in the Host, and that it is impossible that it should be consumed, or else that it never was in the Host: but every one knows by experience that the Hosts are eaten and consumed, and that

that Christ's body cannot be there after the Consumption of the accidents of the bread ; Therefore it never was in the Host.

18. The tenth Argument is drawn from hence , That the pretended presence of Christ's body in the Host, destroys the nature of Christ's body, thus : The properties of a Species are incommunicable to every other Species. For example : The properties of a man are incommunicable to a beast ; for seeing the properties flow from the Essence, or are the very Essence it self, it is evident that if the Essence of a Species be incommunicable to another Species, then the properties of a Species are also incommunicable to another ; but the body and the Spirit are the two Species of substance ; therefore the properties of the Spirit cannot be communicated to the body, as the properties of the body cannot be communicated to the spirit. But there are two principal properties which distinguish bodies from spirits : The first is, That spirits are substances that are penetrable amongst themselves, that is, may be together in one and the same place, but bodies are impenetrable substances amongst themselves, that is, they cannot be together in one and the same place. The second is, That bodies are in a place

place circumscriptively, that is, all the Body is in all the place, but all the body is not in every part of the place, but the parts of the body are in the parts of the place; but spirits are in a place definitively, that is, all the spirit is in all the place, and all the spirit is in every part of the place; because a spirit having no parts, must necessarily be all wheresoever it is. Whence I form my Argument thus: That Doctrine which gives to a body the properties of a spirit, changes the body into a spirit, and consequently destroys the nature of a body, seeing properties cannot be communicated without the essence: But the Doctrine of the pretended presence of Christ's Body in the Host, gives to a body the properties of a spirit, because it affirms that the quantity of Christ's Body penetrates the quantity of the Bread, and is in the same place with it; that all the parts of Christ's Body are penetrated amongst themselves, and are all in one and the same place; and that Christ's Body is all in all the Host, and all in every part of the Host: Therefore the Doctrine of the *Romish Church* touching the pretended presence of Christ's Body in the Host, destroys the nature of Christ's Body.

19. The eleventh Argument is drawn from hence: That Jesus Christ being sate at God's right

right hand is in a glorious estate : and yet
 the Doctrine of the pretended presence of
 Christ's Body in the Host, subjects him to
 divers ignominies, viz. that his Body goes
 into peoples bellies, and amongst their ex-
 crement; that it is subject to be eaten by his
 Enemies, yea by Mice and other Beasts.
 Hear what *Claude de Xaintes*, a famous Ro-
 mish Doctor saith of it, *Repet. 5. Chap. 2.*
Of all these we exclude not one from the true
and corporal receiving of the Lords flesh in the
Sacrament, let him be Turk, Atheist, Infidel, or
Hypocrite; yea, though he should be the Devil
himself incarnate. It is also subject to be stoln,
 for about 25 years since a Thief was Execu-
 ted at *Paris* for stealing out of a Church the
 Chalice and this God in it; and the Priest
 went to the Prison in his sacerdotal Orna-
 ments, and falling on his knees before the
 Thiefs pocket, pulled his God out of it.
 And as it is a God, that cannot keep himself
 from being stoln, so neither can he keep him-
 self from being burnt, as it appeared when
 the *Palace-Hall* at *Paris* was burnt. In short,
 The Host, or God of the Mass, hath been
 seen in the hands of one possessed by the
 Devil, and consequently in the Devils pow-
 er; yea, there are Charms made by the Ro-
 mish Priests to compel the Devil to restore
 God

God to them. A horrible and prodigious thing to put God into the Devil's power, and into a capacity of being eaten by the Devil incarnate, especially, seeing he is now glorious in Heaven.

20. The twelfth Argument is drawn from hence. That God doth no miracles without necessity: but what necessity is there that he should do so many miracles in this Sacrament, viz. that accidents should be without a subject? that the bread should be converted into Christ's body, which is already? That Christ's body should be in a point, and a hundred thousand places at once? What necessity is there that it should be eaten by wicked Men, by Beasts, and by Devils incarnate? What necessity is there that it should be carried away by the Devil, that it should be stolen, burnt, &c. Can it be said that it is for the salvation of the Soul of him that eats it? But Reprobates, as our Adversaries confess, eat it too; and the Faithful under the Old Testament did not eat it, nor do the little children of Believers under the New, and yet they are saved for all that. Can it be said with *Bellarmin* and *Perron*, that the Host being eaten, serves, as an incorruptible feed for a glorious Resurrection? But the Faithful of the Old Testament, and the little children

children of believers under the New, will rise again gloriously, though they never participated of the Eucharist. And St. Paul tells us Rom. 8. that this seed of the resurrection of our bodies is not Christ's Flesh, but his Spirit, in these words, *If the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead, dwell in you, he shall also quicken your mortal Bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you.*

21. Lastly, The holy Scripture is clear in this matter; for Jesus Christ is ascended into Heaven, Acts 1. *And the Heavens must contain him until the time of Restitution of all things,* Acts 3; and he himself saith, *I leave the World and go to the Father,* St. John 16. *The poor ye have always with you, but me ye have not always,* St. Matth. 26. To which may be added what Jesus Christ saith, St. Matth. 24. viz. *In the last days false Prophets will come that shall say, Christ is here or there, and that he is in secret Chambers, (or Cabinets) which cannot be but by the doctrine of the Romish Church, which puts Christ's body in divers places, and shuts it up in several Cabinets on their Altars; and it is very remarkable that in the Greek it is *in τραπεζαῖς*, that is, in the Cupboards, *ταπεζαῖς* being properly a Cupboard to keep meat in.*

C H A P. V.

Against the adoration or worshipping of the Host

1. **A** Gainst the adoration of the Host, form three Propositions ; The first is this, we are not obliged to adore or worship God every where, or in all places where he is, at least not with external adoration but we are only obliged to worship him in all places where he appears in his glorious Majesty. The first part of this Proposition, *viz.* That we are not obliged to worship God in all places where he is, appears by the practice of all Christians. For God being every where and consequently in Stones, Trees, Beasts, Devils, and all other Creatures, there is no man so extravagant as to fall on his knees before a Tree, an Ass, or a Devil, that he may worship God in them, who is as really present in them, as he is in Heaven.

2. The second part of this Proposition, *viz.* that we are only obliged to worship God both with internal and external adoration in all places where he appears in his glorious Majesty, is proved, first, by the commands which Jesus Christ gave his Apostles when they asked him how they should pray ; for he answers them thus ; *When ye pray, say, Our Father*

Father which art in Heaven, St. Matth. 6. St. Luke 11. Why doth he say, *which art in Heaven*, and not which art on Earth, or in the Sea, or in the Air, seeing God is equally in all these Places? But only, because God appears in Heaven in his glorious Majesty, and there crowns all the blessed Spirits with his Glory. Secondly, When God appeared to Moses in the burning Bush, which was not consumed, he said to him, *Take thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place where thou standest is holy Ground*, Exod. 3. Why is this Ground called holy, and Moses commanded to approach it with reverence, submission, and adoration, seeing any other Ground is equally God's Creature, and that he is equally present every where? But only, because God did manifest somewhat of his Power and Glory in that place, by causing the Bush to burn without being consumed. Thirdly, *Joshua and the Israelites did prostrate themselves before the Ark of the Covenant*, Joshua 7. 6. because God appeared there in a peculiar and glorious manner; for, from the Mercy-seat which covered it, he gave his Oracles, and made known his will, Exod. 25. 22. Numb. 7.

Fourthly, When the Priest celebrates Mass, a little before the consecration, he recommends

commends the *sursum corda*, that is, the lifting up of their hearts; Why the lifting them up seeing God is equally both above and below but only because God appears in Heaven in his glorious Majesty; and consequently it thither that we must direct our Vows, our Prayers, and our Worship.

3. The second Proposition is this: We are not obliged to adore Jesus Christ in the water of baptism, though he be really there in regard of all that is adorable in him. The first part of this Proposition, *viz.* That we are not obliged to worship Jesus Christ in the water of baptism, is chiefly proved by the practice of all Christians; for no man ever fell on his knees before the water of baptism and adored Jesus Christ in it, at least not with external Worship, which is only here intended; and doubtless the reason is, because Jesus Christ discovers no beam of his Glory there nor doth he appear in the water of baptism any more than in other waters; so that as we are not obliged to worship God, save only where he appears in his glorious Majesty, as hath been proved; so neither are we obliged to worship Jesus Christ, but only where he discovers some beam of his Glory which he doth not in the water of baptism.

4. The second part of this Proposition, *viz.* That Jesus Christ is really present in the Water of Baptism in respect of all that is to be adored in him, is proved thus: All that is of itself adorable in Jesus Christ, is either his Godhead, or his divine Person, or his divine Attributes. As for his Godhead, seeing it is really every where, it cannot be denied but that it is also in the Water of Baptism. As for his Person, seeing it is divine, and eternal, and infinite, it is really every where, and consequently in the Water of Baptism: and as for his divine Attributes, seeing they are not really different from the Godhead, or the person of Jesus Christ, it necessarily follows, that seeing the Godhead and Person of Jesus Christ are really in the Water of Baptism, his divine Attributes must really be there likewise.

5. The third Proposition is this: We are not obliged to adore Jesus Christ in the Host, though he be really there in respect of all that is to be adored in him, *viz.* in respect of his Godhead, his divine Person, and his divine Attributes; yea, though he were there invisibly in respect of his Manhood too. The principal reason of this hath been toucht upon already; *viz.* That as we are not obliged to worship God in all places where he is (at least

least not with external worship) but the only where he appears in his glorious Majesty, *viz.* ordinarily in Heaven, and extraordinarily else where, as hath been proved in the first Proposition. And as we are not obliged to worship Jesus Christ in the Water of Baptism with external adoration, though he be really there in respect of all that is adorable in him, because he doth not discover the least beam of his Glory there, nor appear in the Water of Baptism more than in other waters, as hath been proved in the second Proposition: Even so we are not obliged to worship Jesus Christ in the Host with external adoration although he be there in respect of all that is to be adored in him, yet though he were there in respect of his Manhood too; because Jesus Christ doth not discover any beam of his glory there, nor doth he appear in the consecrated Hosts any more than in those that are not consecrated; for no man can distinguish the one from the other. And as for his Manhood which is pretended to be there invisibly, I say that there is no sensible mark of its presence, and consequently nothing which obligeth us to external worship, for the same reason as is already alledged; for if the invisible presence of the Godhead, divine Person,

Person, and divine Attributes of Jesus Christ which are of themselves adorable, do not oblige us to external worship in the Water of Baptism, why should the Manhood of Jesus Christ, which is not of it self adorable, oblige us to external adoration though it were in the Host, it being there only, as they say invisibly? In a word, They must shew us the disparity, and tell us the reason why we are not obliged to adore Jesus Christ with external worship in the Water of Baptism, though he be really there present in respect of all that which is adorable in him, *viz.* in respect of his Godhead, his divine Person, and his divine Attributes, and yet are obliged to worship Jesus Christ in the Host with an external worship, though nothing renders him more adorable there than in the water of Baptism.

6. To this the Jesuite *St. Rigan*, one of the most learned of his Order, answers, That although there be nothing in the consecrated Host that renders him more adorable than in the water of Baptism; yet there is something in the Host which obligeth us to external worship, which is not in the water of Baptism; because, saith he, the Manhood of Jesus Christ is in the Host, and
is

is there in stead of a ray of glory; and God will be adored in all places, where the Manhood personally united to the Godhead, is present: But in the Water of Baptism Jesus Christ discovers no beam of his glory, and his Manhood, which is equivalent to a ray of glory, is not there.

7. To this I reply, That the rays or beams of glory which oblige us to external adoration in a certain place, must be sensibly in that place. And therefore seeing the Manhood of Jesus Christ which is pretended and supposed to be really present in the Host is neither visible nor sensible, it cannot be equivalent to a beam of Glory. To which I add, That as the Godhead and Divine person of Jesus Christ which are equally present in the Water of Baptism, and in the Host, do not oblige us to external worship, for this only reason, viz. because they do not discover any ray of their glory there: so neither doth the Manhood of Jesus Christ, pretended and supposed to be really present in the Host, oblige us to external adoration, for this only reason, viz. because it appears not there, nor discovers any ray of its glory. Lastly, I affirm that by the very doctrine and practice of the *Romish* Church it self, we are not obliged to

to adore Jesus Christ in all places where his Manhood is, because, as the *Romish* Doctors confess, we are not obliged to adore Jesus Christ in that Host which the Priest hath newly eaten, and whose accidents are not yet destroyed; nor in that Host which is lockt up in the Cupboard that is on the Altar; nor in that Host which a Priest carries under his Cloak to a sick person in the Country.

8. To this the same Jesuite answers, That although the glory of Christ's Manhood, appears not to our bodily eyes, yet it appears to the eyes of our soul, *viz.* to our Faith; for the greatest glory of Christ's Manhood consists in its being personally united to the Godhead, and in being sustained in a peculiar manner by the Word. Suppose then, says he, that Jesus Christ be in the Host, we are sure that it is personally united to the Godhead, and consequently, the glory of Christ's Manhood, which consists in this personal union, doth certainly appear to our Faith, which is sufficient to oblige us to an external adoration of Jesus Christ in the Host.

9. To this I reply, That there is a twofold glory of God, and of Jesus Christ, or of his Manhood, *viz.* the one essential, internal,

ternal, and hid from our senses ; the other
 accidental, external and apparent to our
 senses : the essential and internal glory of
 God which is hid from our senses, consists
 in the eminence of his perfections, which are
 to be infinite, almighty, most wise, &c. and
 the accidental and external glory of God
 which appears to our senses, consists in some
 miraculous and extraordinary effect, which
 is sensible ; as when God caused a Bush to
 burn without being consumed ; when he
 pronounced his Oracles from above the
 Mercy-seat ; and when, being made man
 and having manifested himself in the flesh
 he commanded the winds and the waves
 to cast out Devils, raised the dead, &c. But
 I affirm that we are not obliged to wor-
 ship God with an external adoration in all
 places where he is, in his essential and in-
 ternal glory only, although it appears
 to our Faith ; because God being every
 where with this essential and internal glo-
 ry, we should be obliged to worship him
 with an external adoration in Trees, in
 Beasts, yea, and in Devils too, which is ab-
 surd : But we are only obliged to worship
 God with external Worship in all places
 where he makes his essential and internal
 glory appear by some accidental and exter-
 na

nal glory, viz. by some Miraculous or extraordinary effect, which is sensible, and equivalent to a Ray of his essential and internal Glory, as appears by what is said in the first Proposition. In like manner the personal union of the Godhead and Manhood, being an essential glory of Jesus Christ, and an internal glory of his Manhood, wholly hid from our senses, doth not oblige us to the external adoration of Jesus Christ, although it certainly appears to our Faith, except it be accompanied with an external and sensible glory; for if the essential and internal glory of the Godhead and divine person of Jesus Christ, which appear equally present to our Faith in the Water of Baptism, do not oblige as to an external adoration of Jesus Christ, except it be accompanied with an accidental, external and sensible glory; why should the internal glory of Christ's Manhood, which is infinitely beneath the essential and internal glory of the Godhead, and appears present to the Faith of those of the *Romish* Church, oblige them to the external adoration of Jesus Christ, if it be separated from all external and sensible glory? To this I add. That according to the doctrine and practice of the *Romish* Church, we are not

D

obliged

obliged to adore Jesus Christ with external adoration in all places where the personal union of the Manhood with the Word, appears to the Faith of those of that Church; for we are not obliged to adore Jesus Christ in that Host which a Priest hath newly swallowed; nor in that host which is lockt up; nor in that host which a Priest carries under his Cloak to a sick person in the Country; although the essential glory of Jesus Christ, and the internal glory of his Manhood (which this Jesuite makes to consist in the personal union of the Manhood with the Word) appear certain to the Faith of those of the *Romish* Church.

10. To this the Jesuite answers, That as if we would obtain any grace from God, considered as he really exists in a stone, we should be obliged to prostration and external worship of the Godhead really present in that stone: so, if we would obtain any grace from Jesus Christ really existing in the host, we are obliged to approach unto it with reverence, and external adoration; and consequently we are obliged to worship Jesus Christ in the host with external adoration whensoever we would obtain any grace from him as he exists in the host.

11. To this I reply, That as we are never obliged to beg grace of God, as he exists in a stone, except he discovers some beam of his glory there, (for it is sufficient to beg grace of God considered as he exists in heaven, where he appears in his glorious Majesty according to the command of Jesus Christ, *when ye pray, say, Our Father which art in heaven*, and according to the command of the Apostle, *lift up your hearts*) so we are never obliged to beg grace of God or Jesus Christ, considered as existing in the host, because he discovers no Ray of his glory there; but it is sufficient to Beg grace of God or Jesus Christ, considered as existing in heaven, because he always appears there in his glorious Majesty. Therefore as we are never obliged to beg grace of God considered as existing in a stone, so we are never obliged to adore him there: and as we are never obliged to beg grace of God or Jesus Christ, considered as existing in the host, so we are never obliged to adore him there with external adoration.

12. To this the Jesuite answers, That God hath done many miracles by his Sacrament, and in it; both by punishing prophane persons, and the despisers of it, and also by making a little child appear upon the Altar,

or flesh in stead of the bread, or blood in stead of the wine: all which ought to be acknowledged as so many Rays of the glory of Christ's Manhood, and that they ever oblige us to the external adoration of Jesus Christ in the Host.

13. To this I reply, That I do not at all doubt but that God hath many times punished prophane persons, and the contemners of this Sacrament, both ordinarily and extraordinarily ; for *St. Paul* 1 *Cor.* 11. tell us that many of those that did receive this Sacrament unworthily, were sick, and many slept, that is, were dead: and *St. Cyprian* in the Treatise of those that fall, observes God's Judgment against wicked and prophane persons, and the contemners of this Sacrament. But as for those apparitions of Jesus Christ in form of a child, and of flesh and blood, &c. I look on them as fabulous stories invented by Monks and other superstitious persons, above seven or eight hundred years after Christ, when the Doctrine of the real presence of Christ's Manhood in the Host, began to prevail, and was powerfully opposed by God's People in those days.

14. Secondly, I say, That although there had been such apparitions, yet we must
not

not infer from thence, either the presence of Christ's Manhood, or external adoration; because that is not Christ's Flesh which seems to be so; and these apparitions may be illusions of the Devil. The Jesuit *Vasquez* in *Disput.* 193. chap. 2. speaks thus. *I answer, That which appears is not the Flesh of Christ, nor of any other that is really Flesh; but it is only an Effigies, or appearance of Flesh; as St. Thomas saith: and whereas the simple are deceived, and do believe that Christ's Flesh is there in a divisible and Bloody manner, it is no great matter; and this deceit must be corrected by the right instruction of the Doctors.* *Gabriel Biel*, a famous Doctor of the Romish Church, *Lesson* 51. upon the *Cannon of the Mass*, saith, that such apparitions of Flesh and Blood may be made by the illusions of the Devil, to deceive the simple, God permitting it to be so; and he gives an example of it, viz. *That in a Convent of Minor Friars at Yfennes in Thuringia, a certain person like unto an Angel, appeared to a Lay-Friar that was preparing himself for the Communion, and thrust into his Mouth a piece of Flesh which as soon as he had swallowed, he was possessed, and grievously tormented by the Devil.* The Jesuit *Suarez*, *Tom.* 3. *Disp.* 55. *Sect.* 3. speaks thus. Ex-

perience tells that by length of time this flesh and this Blood which appear in the Eucharist, are changed and corrupted. But when this happens, saith that famous Romish Doctor Alexander Hales, Sent. 4. Quest. 11. It is a sign that the apparition which was made in that firm, was not made by the power of God, but by the power of the Devil, or by the craft of Man.

15. Thirdly, If it were as true as it is false, that Jesus Christ hath appeared sometimes in the Sacrament of the Eucharist in the form of a little Child, or of Flesh and of Blood; yet I say, that as God, when he appeared to Moses in the Bush that burned without being consumed, was to be worshipped there, for this only reason, because he discovered a beam of his glory by causing the Bush to burn without being consumed; but it doth not follow that God must be worshipped in all other Bushes, though he be as really in them as he was in that for this only reason, because he doth not discover in them any Ray of his glory: so, if Jesus Christ hath sometimes appeared visibly in the Host (which I do not grant) I think then he should have been worshipped, because of such a visible appearance, which is equivalent to a ray of glory;

glory; but it follows not that Jesus Christ must be adored in other Hosts, where his Manhood appears not, though it be really there, for this only reason, because no Ray of his glory appears there.

16. To the three foregoing Propositions I add this Argument, which is very considerable: In lawful adoration it is requisite that he that adores, be well assured that what he adores is the true God, else he may justly be reproached, as Jesus Christ reproached the woman of Samaria, *ye worship ye know not what.* But the Romanists can never be assured (according to their own maxims) that the Host which they worship is the true God; and they have always cause to suspect that they worship a morsel of Bread instead of the Redeemer of the World; because according to their own Doctrine, the real presence of Christ's body in the Host depends on lawful consecration; and lawful consecration depends on the quality of the Priest, and on the pronouncing of the words of consecration, and on his intention in pronouncing them; for there is no consecration (as they say) when either he that celebrates Mass is no Priest, or doth not pronounce the words that are essentially requisite to

consecration, viz. *this is my Body*, &c. or doth not pronounce them with intention to consecrate; and consequently in these cases the Host remains meer bread. But it is impossible certainly to know these three things: For as for the quality of the Priest, he must have been baptized; and he that baptized him must have observed the essential form of Baptism, and have had intention to baptize him: Again he must have received Ordination from a true Bishop; and the Bishop must have observed the essential form of Ordination, and have had intention to make him a Priest; and to make this Bishop a true Bishop, he must have been baptized in due form, and with the requisite intention, and must have received Ordination in due form, and with the requisite intention from other Bishops; and they again, for the making them true Bishops, must also have received Baptism and Ordination in due form, and with the requisite intention, from other true Bishops, and these from others, and so back to the Apostles. But who can be assured that from the Apostles to a Bishop, or Priest, now adays there hath been no failing, either in the essential form of Baptism or Ordination, or in the requisite intention? As
for

for the pronouncing of the words requisite to consecration; none but the Priest can know whether he hath pronounced them or not, because in the celebration of the Mass, those words are pronounced so softly, that no person present can hear them. And as for the intention, it is evident that no man but himself can know it. Besides, It is known that some Priests are Magicians, as *Lewis Giffredi*, and other wicked Priests, who do neither consecrate in due form, nor with the requisite intention, especially such as believe nothing of what they profess; yea, divers Monks and Priests that have been converted to our Religion, have assured us that for a long time before their conversion they did abhor the Idolatry that was practised in the adoration of the Host. Judge then if such persons as these had any intention to consecrate in the celebration of the Mass.

17. The Romish Doctors have sought all the remedies imaginable to prevent this danger. Pope *Adrian* *Quest.* 3. speaks thus: *In the adoration of the Eucharist there is always a tacite condition, viz. if the consecration be truly made; (as hath been decided at the Council of Constance) otherwise they could not be excused from Idolatry, that wor-*

ship the Host when the Priest pretends to Celebrate, but Celebrates not ; or pretends to Celebrate and is no Priest, as it many times happens. Observe these words, *it manytimes happens*, for they shew that there is great cause of doubting, and that much caution must be used. For as if a Woman, in her Husbonds absence should say to a Man that comes to her, and tells her he is her Husband, (and she hath probable grounds to suspect him) *If thou art my Husband I will receive thee*, and thereupon endeavours to clear it before she admits him to any privacy, this condition frees her promise from blame ; but if she gives her self up to him, before she clears this doubt, saying, *I will receive thee if thou art my Husband*, this condition doth not free her action from blame, but she will be reputed an Adulteress. Even so if a man to whom an Host is proposed to be adored, and he hath reason to doubt whether it ought to be adored, should only say, *If thou art Christ I will adore thee*, and should not adore it before he be well assured of it, this condition would render him blameless ; but if, notwithstanding his doubt, he adores it, this condition, *if thou art Christ, I adore thee*, doth not exempt him from the crime of

of Idolatry; for to what purpose is the condition, whether it be tacite, or exprest, *I adore thee if thou art Christ*, because he actually adores it, without knowing whether it be so or not?

18. To what hath been said, I add, That the Primitive Church never adored the Host nor believed that the body and blood of Christ were really and invisibly in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, for if the Christians of the Primitive Church had believed it, they had furnished the Heathens with specious pretences to excuse the Idolatry of their Image-worship, and to retort upon the Christians those very arguments which they had made use of against them.

19. First, The Heathens did maintain that their Idols were composed of two things, viz. of a visible Image and an invisible Deity dwelling in it. *They bring their gods, saith St. Chrysostom in Theodoret in Atrep, into their base images of wood and stone, and shut them up there as in a prison. Your gods, saith Arnobius Book 6. dwell in Plaster and baked Earth; and, that they may make these materials more venerable, they suffer themselves to be shut up, and to remain hid and detained in an obscure prison. But* might

might not the Heathens have justly replied to the Ancient Christians, if they had believed what the *Romish* Doctors do now adays; And do not you believe the very same of your Host, that it is composed of two things, *viz.* of the visible species of bread, and the invisible body of Christ, which is hid under the species? Doth not your Christ dwell in baked dough, and that he may make a piece of Bread more venerable, doth he not suffer himself to be shut up, and doth he not remain hid, as in a prison?

20. Secondly, The Heathens held that consecration was the means whereby the Deity which they adored, was made present in the Image. So *Tertullian* in his *Apolog.* chap. 12. saith, *I find nothing to object against Images, but that the matter of them is such as our Frying-pans and Kettles are made of, which changeth its destiny by consecration.* And *Minutius Felix* speaks thus of a Pagan Image, Behold it is melted, forged, fashioned, and yet is not God; behold it is gilded, finished, erected, and yet is not God; behold it is adorned, consecrated, and worshipped, and then it is God. And *Arnobius* in Book 6. *Dedication or Consecration makes them dwell in Images, they refuse not to dwell in habitations of Earth, or rather, being forced*

forced to go into them by the right of Dedication, they are incorporated, and joyned to the Images. But might not the Heathens have replied to the Christians thus; We find it just so in your Eucharist, viz. that the signs are of the same matter with our common Bread and Wine, but change their destiny by consecration; behold it is kneaded, and moulded, and yet it is not God; behold it is baked in the Oven, and yet it is not God; behold it is consecrated and adored, and then it is God; for your Christ doth not refuse to enter into these earthly matters, or rather, being forced to go into them by the right of consecration, he is incorporated and joyned to the species of the Bread and Wine?

21. Thirdly, The Heathens had both great and little Images, and did believe that the Deity, which they worshipped; was as well in the little as in the great ones. *Arnobius* in Book 6. jeers them for this, saying, that *If their Gods had their great and little Images in which they dwell, they must needs be straightned for want of room in the little ones, whereas in the great ones they might stretch themselves out at their full length.* But might not the Heathens have reproached the
the

the Christians of those times in the same manner if they had believed that Jesus Christ had been wholly contained as well in a little Host as in a great one, and as well in the least part of the Host as in the greatest.

22. Lastly, The Heathens were reproached for worshipping Wood and Stone, the work of mens hands; things that cannot see, hear, smell, taste, breathe, speak, or move; things exposed to age, rust, corruption, dust, falling, breaking, burning, &c. to the Injuries of Worms, Mice, and other Beasts; subject to the power of Enemies, to be stoln, lockt up, &c. as you may read in *Arnobius*, *Lactantius*, *Minutius Felix*, and other ancient Doctors of the Church. But if those ancient Christians had believed what the Romanists now do, might not the Heathens have replied thus? And can you deny that the Host which you worship is the work of a mans hands, that moulded it, and gave it such a form as pleased him, and then consecrated it with certain words to make your Christ come in into it whole and entire? Do not you adore your Host, which neither sees, nor hears, nor smells, nor breathes, nor walks, nor speaks, nor moves? Is not your Host

Host subject to age, dust, falling, burning, to Worms, to Mice, and other Beasts? Is it not subject to be taken away, stolen, lockt up, &c. But if it be said that the accidents of the Host are only subject to these inconveniences, and not Jesus Christ that is under them; I answer that the Heathens had said the same, viz. that their Gods were not subject to these inconveniences, but the Images only in which they were; for in *Arnobius* his 6 Book, they speak thus: *We believe not the Copper, Gold, and Silver, whereof the Images are made, to be Gods and Deities, that of themselves deserve adoration; but in these materials we adore those that sacred dedication introduceth, and causeth to dwell in the Images.*

CHAP. VI.

Against the taking away of the Cup.

I. **T**HE taking away of the Eucharistical Cup was established as an Article of Faith by the *Romish Church Representative*, assembled in Council at *Constance*, Anno 1415. Session 13. in a Canon, the chief clauses whereof are these: *Seeing that in divers parts of the World there be some who rashly presume to say, that Christian people ought*
to

to partake of the Sacrament of the Eucharist under both species of the Bread and Wine ; and do give the Communion to Lay people, not only under the species of the Bread, but also under the species of the Wine ; this present holy general Council of Constance, lawfully assembled in the name of the Holy Ghost, being desirous to provide for the safety of the faithful against this error, doth therefore declare, decree, and determine, that although Jesus Christ did administer this venerable Sacrament to his Disciples under both the species of Bread and Wine ; and although in the Primitive Church the Faithful did receive this Sacrament under both species, yet notwithstanding that (for the avoiding of certain dangers and scandals) this custom, which was introduced with reason, ought to be kept, viz. that Priests that say Mass shall communicate under both the species of the Bread and Wine, but that Lay-persons shall communicate under the species of Bread only : and they that shall say the contrary, ought to be expelled as Hereticks, and grievously punished by the Bishops, or their Officials ; This Canon was confirmed by the succeeding Romish Councils, and particularly by the Council of Trent.

2. Against so horrible a Canon, and so strange a Law, it is very difficult to oppose any

any thing ; for, if you tell them that this Law is contrary to the Institution and command of Jesus Christ, they freely confess it : seeing that although Jesus Christ did institute and administer the Eucharist under both species, yet they will not have it so practised. If you tell them that this Law is contrary to the command of St. Paul, and practice of the Primitive Church, they ingenuously own it ; for they openly declare, that although the Faithful in the Primitive Church did receive the Sacrament of the Eucharist under both species, yet they that practice it thus, ought to be expelled and punished as Hereticks. This is the true way of ending all Controversies, and of keeping us from disputing with them. For Example, If we alledge that St. Paul, 1 Tim. 4. saith, that *they who forbid to marry, and command to abstain from meats, do teach the doctrines of Devils ;* they need only answer, That although St. Paul doth say so, yet we must not believe it, because the Romish Church hath determined otherwise. Again, If we alledge, That the same Apostle Ephes. 2. saith, that *we are saved by grace, through faith ; and that not of ourselves, it is the gift of God ; not of works, lest any man should boast ;* they need only answer, That although

although this was written by the Apostle yet we must not believe it, because the *Romish* Church hath determined, that we are saved by works and faith as coming from ourselves, and from the strength of our own free will, &c. And now I leave you to judge whom we ought to follow, whether these lying Doctors, or Jesus Christ and his Apostles. But that which I find utterly insupportable is this, *viz.* that they accuse of rashness, error, and heresie, those that by obeying Jesus Christ and his Apostles, and following the practice of the Primitive Church, do affirm that we ought to partake of the Cup as well as of the Bread. Again, I find it an insufferable piece of impudence, that they boast so much of antiquity, and of the conformity of their Creed to that of the primitive Church, and yet can so openly renounce both in this chief and principal point of doctrine.

3. Here the *Romish* Doctors now adays think to shelter themselves, By telling us it is true that Jesus Christ did institute the Sacrament of the Eucharist under both the species of the Bread and Wine: and that the Primitive Church did so celebrate it, not by any express command of Jesus Christ

Christ and his Apostles, but meerly by Ecclesiastical policy, which may be changed, as several occasions and circumstances require. And they add, That it is sufficient to observe that which is of the essence of the Sacrament, *viz.* to receive the body and Blood of Christ; but that the Church may change that which is accidental, *viz.* to receive them under both the species, or under one species only, for they will have it, that the blood of Christ is under the species of Bread, by concomitance, and that his body is under the species of the Wine by concomitance; because Jesus Christ being now glorious, his body and blood cannot be separated.

4. To this I reply, First, that there is an express command of Jesus Christ to take the Cup and drink, *St. Matth. 26.* In these words, *drink ye all of it.* To this the *Romish* Doctors answer, That the word *all* is not extended to all men; for then we should say that the Eucharistical Cup ought to be given to *Turks, Jews,* and all other *Infidels.* And they add, that the word *all* doth not extend to all those that are of the body of the Church of the Elect, for then the Eucharistical cup should be given to little children, whom God hath elected to eternal life: But say they, the word *all* is

ex-

extended only to all those, to whom Jesus Christ gave the cup, *viz*, to the Apostles considered as they were Pastors.

5. To this I reply, That although Jesus Christ gave this command to drink of the Eucharistical cup to his Apostles only, yet we must know in what quality they received the command: But it was not in the quality of Apostles, for then none but Apostles could partake of the cup; and there being now no more Apostles, it should be quite taken away and so Mass could be no more celebrated. And it was not in quality of Pastors, or sacrificing Priests; for Jesus Christ was then the only Sacrificer, as the *Romish* Doctors say, and the Apostles did not then exercise the Function of sacrificing Priests. Besides, it belongs to Pastors, and those that administer the Sacraments, being publick persons, to give, and to private persons to receive only: But the Apostles in the celebration of the Eucharist, did only receive of Jesus Christ their Master and Pastor: Therefore they received the command to drink of the cup, as they were Believers. Whence it follows that all the faithful that partake of the Sacrament of the Eucharist, are obliged by the command of Jesus Christ to drink of the cup.

up. So then the *Romish* Doctors are mistaken when they tell us that none but Priests that sacrifice have a right to drink of the cup, and that those Priests that do not sacrifice, must communicate under the species of the Bread only, for at that time the Apostles did not sacrifice. To this may be added, that if the command of Jesus Christ, *drink ye all of it*, was spoken to Pastors only, because they to whom Christ spake were Pastors; then it follows that the command of Jesus Christ, *Take, eat*, was spoken to Pastors only, because they to whom Jesus Christ spake were Pastors; and so the people will not be obliged by any command to communicate under the species of the bread, and consequently will be wholly deprived of the Sacrament, which is very absurd, and contrary to Christian Religion.

6. Secondly, I say, That in *1 Corintb. I.* there is an exprefs command to all the Faithful to drink of the Cup, in these words, *Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of this Bread, and drink of this Cup.* In which words the Apostle speaks to all Believers, who, no doubt, have cause to examine themselves. And this is apparent, because *St. Paul* directs his Epistle (and consequently these words) to all those of the

the Church of *Corinth*, as well Laymen as Ecclesiastical; for in *chap. 1. verse 1.* he directed it to all that in every place call upon the name of *Jesus Christ our Lord*. To this, I add, That *Jesus Christ* doth not only say, as often as ye eat this bread, but also, as often as ye drink the cup, ye do shew the *Lords death* till he come; so that we do as much commemorate *Christ's death* by partaking of the cup in the *Eucharist*, as we do by partaking of the bread. And this is very proper; for seeing that not only the *Body of Christ* was broken, but also his *Blood shed* on the *Cross*; and that in every propitiation and expiation for sin, the effusion of *Blood* was very considerable (because it represents death better than any thing else doth) it is certain that they do not celebrate the memory of *Christ's death* as they ought that do not partake off this part of the *Sacrament*, whereby only we commemorate the effusion of *Christ's Blood*.

7. Thirdly, I say, that in the dispute about the *Eucharist*, our Adversaries do acknowledge to us the words of *Jesus Christ* in *chap. 6. of St. John's Gospel*, *Except ye drink the blood of the Son of man, ye have no life in you.* Why then do they deprive the people of life, by taking the cup from them,

and

and hindring them from drinking? And it is not at all to the purpose here to alledge concomitance, and to tell us that by taking Christ's body under the species of the bread, we take his blood also, because 'tis inseparable from his body. For, to this I answer, First, That to take Christ's blood in taking the Host, is not to drink it: But Jesus Christ saith expressly, Except a man drink his blood he hath no life in him. Secondly, I say, That although in some places by the body, should be meant the body and blood too, yet it could not be in those places where a manifest distinction is made between the body and the blood: But in the Sacrament of the Eucharist this distinction is very apparent; for Jesus Christ gave first the Sacrament and sign of his body in these words, *Take, eat, this is my body, which is broken for you*: and then separately the Sacrament of his blood, in these words, *Drink ye all of it, for this is my blood, which is shed for you*. And he not only speaks of them separately, but represents them as really separated in his death, for he saith, *my body broken for you, and my blood shed for you*. In which words there is no place for concomitance; for the body broken by divers wounds doth not contain the blood, and the blood

blood being shed, is not contained in the body. Also our Adversaries affirm, that the Sacramental words do operate that which they signifie; But by their own confession they signifie the separation of Christ's Body from his Blood, as Card. Perron acknowledgeth in his reply to the King of Great Britain pag. 1108. in these words, *The scope of the entireness of this Sacrament, is to put us in mind that this body and this blood which we receive, were divided by his death on the Cross; whence St. Paul saith, as often as we eat this bread, and drink this cup, we shew the Lord's death till he come.* Thirdly, I say, That as he that eats bread dipt in Wine, hath indeed Wine in his mouth, but doth not drink it; so he that should eat or swallow a consecrated Host, would not drink Christ's Blood, though it were in it.

1. Lastly, I say, That seeing the Sacraments were instituted to assure us the more of the truth of God's promises, and that all our comfort depends on this perswasion, that all God's promises are most true; it necessarily follows, that as much of the Sacrament as is taken away, so much of the certainty of this perswasion is diminished. And 'tis to no purpose to say that one

one part of the Sacrament doth as much confirm God's promises as the whole Sacrament doth; for if it be so, then God hath unnecessarily instituted two Sacraments; for it had been enough to have instituted Baptism only, seeing it is ordained to confirm God's promises. But, if for such a confirmation two Sacraments are better than one, and if two pledges, and two seals for that purpose, are of more consequence than one alone; then in one Sacrament also, two signs are of more weight than one alone, for the confirmation of God's promises. And seeing it is said St. *Luke* 22. and 1 *Cor.* 11. that the cup is the New Testament, and the new Covenant in the blood of Christ, because it is the Sacrament of it, why then are people deprived of it?

9. As for the imaginary dangers and scandals which the *Romish* Doctors find in peoples partaking of the Cup, I say in general, that Jesus Christ (in whom the treasures of wisdom are hid, and in whom the fulness of the Godhead dwells bodily) foresaw them as well as they; and yet he instituted and administered the Cup, and commanded all to drink of it. And St. *Paul* who was extraordinarily inspired by the Holy Ghost, doth (notwithstanding these pre-

E

tended

tended dangers and scandals) command the *Corinthians*, as well Lay persons as Ecclesiastical, to drink of the cup, as hath been already proved.

10. The first inconvenience which our Adversaries find in peoples partaking of the Cup, is that they fear they may dip their moustaches in the Chalice, and so the Blood of Christ may remain on some hair of the moustache; also they fear that the species of the Wine, and consequently Christ's Blood, may fall to the Ground, and being fallen it cannot be gathered up again.

To this I answer: First, That Women, Eunuchs, and such young men as have no beards, ought not to be excluded.

Secondly, It is better to be without Moustaches, than without the participation of the whole Sacrament.

Thirdly, This inconvenience proceeds only from a false supposition, *viz.* that Christ's Blood is under the species of the Wine; but if in the Sacrament of the Eucharist there be nothing but Bread and Wine in substance, and any of it should fall to the Ground accidentally, and not through any fault of ours, this inconvenience is not great enough to violate the institution and command

mand of Jesus Christ and his Apostles.

11. The second inconvenience is, That it is almost impossible to observe this Law where there is a great number of people and but one Priest.

To this I answer, First, That in places where there is much people, as in Cities, there are divers Priests.

Secondly, If one Priest be not enough, another must be called from some neighbouring place.

Thirdly, That which cannot be done in one day, must be done in two or three days, rather than the command of Jesus Christ should be violated, and the practice of the Primitive Church abandoned.

12. The third inconvenience is, that some have a natural antipathy, or aversion to Wine, and consequently cannot drink of the cup.

To this I answer, That because corporal actions do depend on certain natural powers, they are supposed to be commanded to those that have natural powers proper to exercise those actions, and to none else. For example, The hearing of God's Word is not commanded to deaf persons, but to those that can hear it; but drinking of Wine is a corporal action, and therefore

tended dangers and scandals) command the *Corinthians*, as well Lay persons as Ecclesiastical, to drink of the cup, as hath been already proved.

10. The first inconvenience which our Adversaries find in peoples partaking of the Cup, is that they fear they may dip their moustaches in the Chalice, and so the Blood of Christ may remain on some hair of the moustache; also they fear that the species of the Wine, and consequently Christ's Blood, may fall to the Ground, and being fallen it cannot be gathered up again.

To this I answer: First, That Women, Eunuchs, and such young men as have no beards, ought not to be excluded.

Secondly, It is better to be without Moustaches, than without the participation of the whole Sacrament.

Thirdly, This inconvenience proceeds only from a false supposition, *viz.* that Christ's Blood is under the species of the Wine; but if in the Sacrament of the Eucharist there be nothing but Bread and Wine in substance, and any of it should fall to the Ground accidentally, and not through any fault of ours, this inconvenience is not great enough to violate the institution and command

mand of Jesus Christ and his Apostles.

11. The second inconvenience is, That it is almost impossible to observe this Law where there is a great number of people and but one Priest.

To this I answer, First, That in places where there is much people, as in Cities, there are divers Priests.

Secondly, If one Priest be not enough, another must be called from some neighbouring place.

Thirdly, That which cannot be done in one day, must be done in two or three days, rather than the command of Jesus Christ should be violated, and the practice of the Primitive Church abandoned.

12. The third inconvenience is, that some have a natural antipathy, or aversion to Wine, and consequently cannot drink of the cup.

To this I answer, That because corporal actions do depend on certain natural powers, they are supposed to be commanded to those that have natural powers proper to exercise those actions, and to none else. For example, The hearing of God's Word is not commanded to deaf persons, but to those that can hear it; but drinking of Wine is a corporal action, and therefore

commanded to those only that can drink it. So that if the cup must be taken from all Lay-people, because some of them have a natural antipathy to Wine; then the preaching of the Gospel must be taken from Christians, because some of them are deaf, and cannot hear it.

12. The fourth inconvenience is, That there are some Countries where no Wine grows, as in *Lapland, Norway, &c.*

To this I answer; First, That although no Wine grows in those Countries yet some may be brought thither.

Secondly, But if none can be brought without being spoiled, and its form changed, then it is better to substitute the ordinary drink of the Country in stead of Wine.

Thirdly, But if this common drink of the Country may not be substitute instead of Wine, then they that cannot have Wine, do abstain from it, because they are forced thereunto; and it is neither impudence nor contempt, to abstain from a thing commanded by Jesus Christ, when it is not to be had: but to ordain that they that have Wine in abundance shall abstain from the cup, is an unsufferable boldness, and a most unchristian contempt of the Sacrament.

CHAP. VII.

Against the Mass.

1. **T**HE Mass, according to the *Romish* Doctors, is a Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ propitiatory for the sins of the living and dead; and so it is defined by the Council of *Trent*, *Session* 22. Against such a Mass we might alledge all the Arguments already made use of against Transubstantiation, and the pretended presence of Christ's Body in the Host; for our Adversaries confess that those reasons which destroy Transubstantiation, and the pretended presence of Christ's Body in the Host, do also destroy the Mass. But in this Chapter we shall only use such Arguments as are directly against the Mass, and do utterly destroy it.

2. The first Argument is drawn from this, *viz.* that in the institution and first celebration of the Eucharist, Jesus Christ did not sacrifice nor offer his Body and Blood to his Father, as appears by what is mentioned by the three Evangelists and the Apostle *St. Paul*, in which there is not the least foot step to be seen of a Sacrifice; or obligation of Christ's body and blood. This *Bellarmin* confesseth in *Book* 1. of the *Mass*,

chap. 27. in these words, *The oblation which is made after consecration, belongs to the intireness of the Sacrament, but is not of its essence; which I prove, because neither our Lord nor his Apostles, did make this Oblation at the first, as we have demonstrated out of Gregory: The Jesuite Salmeron in Tom. 13. of his Commentaries on the Epistles of St. Paul, makes a Catalogue of unwritten Traditions, in which he puts the Ecclesiastical Hierarchie, the worshipping of Images, the Mass, the manner of sacrificing, and the tradition that Jesus Christ did offer a sacrifice in the Bread and Wine. Card. Baronius in his Annals on the year 53. freely confesseth that the sacrifice of the Eucharist is an unwritten Tradition. A strange thing that the Mass, which is the foundation of the Romish Church (for the Doctors require nothing of the people, but that they should go to Mass) cannot be found to have been instituted or commanded by Jesus Christ! And the truth is, if Jesus Christ in the celebration of the Eucharist had offered unto God his Father a sacrifice of his Body and Blood, propitiatory for the sins of the living and dead, then there had been no need that he should have been sacrificed again on the Cross; because, having already expiated our sins*
in

in the sacrifice of the Eucharist, there was no need he should expiate them again on the Cross. To this I add, that St. Paul, *Epheſ. 4.* 11. mentions the Offices which Jeſus Chriſt left his Church, when he aſcended into Heaven, in theſe words, *He gave ſome Apoſtles, and ſome Prophets, and ſome Evangeliſts and ſome Paſtors, and Teachers,* but makes no mention at all of the Sacrificers of Chriſt's Body and Blood, nor in *1 Tim.* nor in the Epistle to *Titus*, when he deſcribes the duty of Biſhops, Preſbyters, and Deacons, without making the leaſt mention of this ſacrificing of Chriſt's Body and Blood.

3. The ſecond Argument is drawn from the definition of a Sacrifice, as it is given us by our Adverſaries: Card. *Belarmin* in *Book 1.* of the *Maſs*, chap 2. defines it thus: *Sacrifice is an external oblation made to God alone, whereby in acknowledgment of humane infirmity, and the divine Majeſty, the lawful Miniſter conſecrates by a myſtical ceremony, and deſtroys ſomething that is ſenſible and permanent.* From theſe laſt words, viz. that the lawful Miniſter deſtroys ſomething that is ſenſible, I form two Arguments which deſtroy the ſacrifice of the Maſs.

The firſt is this, In every ſacrifice the thing ſacrificed muſt fall under our ſenſes ;

for our Adversaries say it is a sensible thing : But the Body and Blood of Christ, which are pretended to be sacrificed in the Mass, under the accidents of the Bread and Wine, do not fall under our senses, as we find by experience : Therefore the body and blood of Christ which are pretended to be under the accidents of the bread and wine, are not the thing sacrifice.

The second Argument is this : In every true sacrifice the thing sacrificed must be utterly destroyed ; that is, it must be so changed, that it must cease to be what it was before, as *Bellarmin* saith in express terms in the place above cited : But in the pretended Sacrifice of the Mass, Christ's body and blood are not destroyed, for *Jesus Christ dieth no more, Rom. 6.* Therefore in the pretended Sacrifice of the Mass, the body and blood of Christ are not the thing sacrificed.

4. To these two Arguments *Bellarmin* in *Book 1. of the Mass, ch. 27.* and other *Romish* Doctors answer, that Christ's body simply is not the thing sacrificed in the Mass, but it is Christ's body, as it is under the species of the bread, that Christ's body is sensible and visible.

Secondly,

Secondly, They answer that in the sacrifice of the Mass, Christ's body is destroyed in respect of its sacramental being, but not in respect of its natural being; for when it is eaten in the Sacrament it ceaseth to be under the species of the Bread.

5. To these answers I reply, First, That Christ's body is not visible by the species of the bread, because, as our Adversaries say, that hides it from us, and hinders us from seeing it. And although a substance may be visible and cognizable by its accidents, yet it is never so by the accident of another substance; and consequently Jesus Christ may be said to be visible by his own accidents, but not by the accidents of the bread, which is just alike both in the consecrated and unconsecrated Hosts; and 'tis a ridiculous shift to say that Christ's body is visible under the species of the bread, because that species is visible; for as we cannot see Wine that is in a Hogshead, because we see the Hogshead; and we cannot see the Money that is in a Purse closed, because we see the Purse; so neither can we see the body under the species of the bread, because we see the species; for as our adversaries say, that species hinders us from seeing it.

6. Secondly, I say, That by the sacramental being is understood, only an accidental being of Jesus Christ (for Example his presence in the Sacrament) or else besides that, is understood his substantial being too. If his substantial being be also understood (seeing the substantial being of a thing is nothing else but its substance and nature) then it will follow that if Jesus Christ be destroyed in the Sacrament of the Eucharist in respect of his substantial being, he must also be destroyed in respect of his natural being, which is contrary to what the Apostle saith, *Rom. 6. that Jesus Christ dieth no more.* If an accidental being of Jesus Christ be only understood (for example, his presence in the Sacrament) then these absurdities will follow, *viz.*

First, That the Sacrifice of the Mass will be the Sacrifice of an accident only, and not of Jesus Christ, because the presence of Jesus Christ is not Jesus Christ himself, but an accident of him.

Secondly, It will follow that the Sacrifice of the Mass, and that of the Cross will not be the same sacrifice in reference to the thing sacrificed, because Jesus Christ, and his presence are not the same thing; Jesus Christ being a substance, and his presence an

an accident, which is contrary to the decision of the Council of *Trent*, which hath determined that the Sacrifice of the Mass, and that of the Cross, are the same in reference to the thing sacrificed.

Thirdly, It will follow that the thing which is destroyed in the Sacrament, is not the same with that, which was produced there, because there is only an accident destroyed, whereas a substance was produced by Transubstantiation, it is a substantial conversion, as hath been sufficiently proved.

Fourthly, It will follow that the sacrifice of the Mass will be offered in the Priests stomach only, because this presence is not destroyed till the Priest hath eaten the Host ; and consequently, the sacrifice of the Mass will be offered after the Mass, for this presence is only destroyed by the destruction of the accidents ; and commonly these accidents are not destroyed till after Mass is said.

Fifthly, It will follow that the justice of God will cease to be the same ; for whereas heretofore it could not be satisfied but by the death of Christ, and by the destruction of his natural being ; now God is appeased, our sins expiated, and Gods justice satisfied by the destruction of his sacramental being only ;
for

for they will have it, that the sacrifice of the Mass is propitiatory for the sins of the living and the dead.

7. The third Argument is drawn from these words of the Apostle, *Heb. 9. Almost all things are by the Law purged with blood, and without shedding of blood is no remission: It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the Heavens should be purified with these, but the Heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than be se.* From which words I form this Argument. There is no propitiation, or remission of sins without shedding of blood, as the Apostle saith: But in the the Mass there is no shedding of Blood (for it is called an unbloody Sacrifice:) Therefore in the Mass there is no propitiation or remission of sins; and consequently no propitiatory sacrifice for sin. This Argument may be thus confirmed; Under the Old Testament there was no propitiation or purification, without shedding of blood, and the types of Heavenly things were so purified, as the Apostle saith, *Heb. 9.* Therefore under the New Testament also there can be no propitiation or purification without shedding of blood, and heavenly things being represented by the legal types, must be purified by a more excellent sacrifice, viz. by the shedding

ding of Christ's blood. And although the Apostle useth the word *Sacrifices* in the plural number, yet we must understand the only Sacrifice of Christ on the Cross; because when one thing is opposed to many, it is often expressed in the plural number; as when Baptism, which is but one, is called Baptisms, *Heb. 6. 2.* But the only sacrifice of the Cross of Christ in the Text above cited, *Heb. 9. 23.* is opposed to the old Sacrifices, which were Types and Figures of the Sacrifice of the Cross.

8. The fourth Argument is drawn from the words of the Apostle, *Heb. 10. 16.* *This is the Covenant which I will make with them after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my Laws into their hearts, and in their minds will I write them, and their sins and iniquities will I remember no more. Now where remission of those is, there is no more offering for sin.* Whence I form this Argument: Where there is remission of sins there is no need of an oblation, or a propitiatory sacrifice for sin, as the Apostle saith: But in the Christian Church, by vertue of the New Testament, or New Covenant, confirmed by the blood of Christ, there is remission of sins, *Heb. 10. 16, 17.* Therefore in the Christian Church now adays, there is no need of an oblation, or
pro-

propitiatory Sacrifice, and consequently no need of the Sacrifice of the Mass.

9. The fifth Argument is drawn from the words of the Apostle, Heb. 9. *Jesus Christ offereth not himself often, as the High Priest entereth into the holy place every year with the blood of others; for then must he often have suffered from the foundation of the World, but now once in the end of the World, hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. And as it is appointed to men once to die, but after this the judgment, so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many, and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto Salvation.* This is confirmed by the words of the same Apostle, Heb. 10. *The Law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those Sacrifices which they offered year by year, continually make the comers thereunto perfect, for then would they not have ceased to be offered, because the worshippers once purged should have had no more conscience of sins. But in those a remembrance is made again of sins every year; for it is not possible that the blood of Bulls and of Goats should take away sins; &c. And every High Priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same Sacrifices which can never take away sins; but this man after he had*
offered

no offered one Sacrifice for sins, for ever sate down
 the on the right hand of God. For by one offering
 he hath for ever perfected them that are sancti-
 fied: which is conformable to what he had
 said a little before, that we are sanctified by
 the offering of the Body of Jesus Christ once
 for all. From all which I form these Argu-
 ments.

10. First, The old Sacrifices were reiterated,
 for the Apostle saith, that the high Priest en-
 tereth into the holy place every year with the
 blood of others: but the Sacrifice of Jesus Christ
 must not be reiterated, for the same Apostle
 saith that Jesus Christ offereth not himself often;
 and that he hath once appeared to put away sin
 by the sacrifice of himself: Therefore the Sacri-
 fice of the Mass is not the sacrifice of the Cross
 reiterated, or the reiteration of the Sacrifice
 of the Cross, as our adversaries would have it.

11. Secondly the Apostle adding, else he
 should often have suffered from the foundation
 of the World, makes it appear that Christ
 cannot be offered without suffering: For, as
 he that should say, this is not fire else it
 would be hot, doth necessarily presuppose
 that fire is hot; and as he that should say he
 is no man else he would be rational, doth ne-
 cessarily presuppose that man is rational:
 so when the Apostle saith, that Jesus Christ
 offereth

offereth not himself often, otherwise he would often have suffered, doth necessarily presuppose that Jesus Christ cannot offer himself without suffering: But Jesus Christ doth not suffer every day in the Mass: Therefore he is not offered every day in the Mass by the Ministry of Priests.

12. Thirdly, These words *from the foundation of the World*, are of great weight, for 'tis as much as if the Apostle had said, if the only Sacrifice of Christ on the Cross be not sufficient to take away sins which shall be committed hereafter, it follows that it was not sufficient to take away sins which have been committed heretofore from the creation of the World, for it is very unsuitable that the sacrifice of Christ on the Cross should have more vertue before it was offered than since: But the sacrifice of Christ on the Cross, had the vertue to take away sins before it was, *otherwise* (saith the Apostle) *he should often have suffered from the foundation of the World*: Therefore it hath also vertue to take away sins committed since it was, and consequently there is no need that it should be reiterated in the Mass.

13. Fourthly, The Apostles comparison is considerable, the sense whereof is this: As men suffer Death but once, and after death appear

appear no more till the day of the resurrection, and day of judgment ; so Christ hath offered himself to his Father once for all on the Cross to take away sins, and will be no more on Earth until he comes to judge the quick and the dead. This utterly destroys the Mass in which Jesus Christ is said to be offered and sacrificed continually by the Minister of Priests.

14. Fifthly, Sacrifices that take away sins, and sanctifie those that come thereunto, ought not to be reiterated ; for the only reason which the Apostle alledgeth, why the old Sacrifices of the Law were reiterated, is because they could not take away sins, nor sanctifie the comers thereunto as appears by the Text above cited. But the Sacrifice of Jesus Christ on the Cross, takes away sins and sanctifies those that come thereunto : Therefore the sacrifice of Jesus Christ on the Cross, ought not to be reiterated, and consequently is not reiterated in the Mass.

15. If Jesus Christ did offer himself a sacrifice on the Cross that he might sanctifie us for ever, and purchase eternal redemption for us, then it is evident that the fruit and efficacy of this sacrifice endures for ever, and that we must have recourse to no other sacrifice but to that of the Cross: But Jesus

fus Christ did offer himself a Sacrifice on
 the Cross that he might sanctifie us for ever
 and purchase eternal redemption for us, as ap-
 pears by the Text aforesaid: Therefore the
 efficacy of the Sacrifice of the Cross endure
 for ever, and we must have recourse to no o-
 ther Sacrifice but to that of the Cross. In a
 word, either we must confess that the Sacri-
 fice of the Cross hath no vertue to take away
 sins, and to sanctifie us for ever, (which is con-
 trary to what the Apostle saith) or else if it
 hath this vertue and sufficiency, then Jesus
 Christ hath offered one only Sacrifice once
 for all, and consequently is not offered daily
 in the Mass by the Ministry of Priests.

16. Lastly, The Apostle almost throughout
 the whole Epistle to the *Hebrews*, saith, that
 Jesus Christ was constituted and consecrated
 by his Father, High Priest for ever; and par-
 ticularly *chap. 7.* he saith, That *many were*
made Priests, because they were not suffered to con-
tinue by reason of death; but Jesus Christ because
he continueth for ever, hath an unchangeable Priest-
hood; and that he is able to save them to the ut-
termost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever
liveth to make intercession for them; and conse-
 quently he hath no need of Vicars, or com-
 panions in his Priesthood.

17. In answer to these Arguments the *Romish* Doctors are wont to say that the Sacrifice of the Mass is the same with that of the Cross, in respect of the essence of the Sacrifice, the same thing being offered in both, *viz.* the body and blood of Christ by the same Priest, *viz.* by Jesus Christ: But it differs in respect of the manner of offering; for on the Cross Jesus Christ offered himself bloodily, that is, when he died he shed his blood for mankind; but in the Mass he offers himself unbloodily, that is, without shedding his blood, and without dying: On the Cross Jesus Christ was destroyed in respect of his natural being, but in the Mass he is destroyed in respect of his sacramental being. They add, that all the Arguments drawn from the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, respect only that bloody oblation which was once offered on the Cross; but besides this bloody Sacrifice there is another that is unbloody, which is daily offered in the Mass. Lastly, they say that the Sacrifice of the Cross is Primitive and Original, but this of the Mass representative, commemorative, and applicative of that of the Cross, as the Council of *Trent* hath in its 22 Session.

18. To these distinctions I reply, that the Sacrifice of the Mass doth not differ from that

that of the Cross in respect of the manner only (which is but an accidental difference) but it differs in respect of essence too.

First, Because the natural death of Jesus Christ is of the essence of the sacrifice of the Cross: But the sacrifice of the Mass doth not comprehend the natural death of Jesus Christ, for *Jesus Christ dieth no more*, Rom. 6. Therefore the sacrifice of the Mass, doth not comprehend that which is of the essence of the sacrifice of the Cross, and consequently differs from it essentially, and not in respect of the manner only.

Secondly, Because the representation of a thing differs essentially from the thing represented: For example, The King's Picture differs essentially from the King. Also the memorial of the thing differs essentially from the thing whereof it is a memorial: For example, The celebration of the Passeeover, which was a memorial of the Angels favourable passing over the houses of the *Israelites*, differs essentially from that passing over. And lastly, the Application of a thing differs essentially from it: For Example, The Application of a Plaister, differs essentially from the Plaister. But according to the determination of the Council of *Trent*, in *Session 22*. The sacrifice of the Mass is representative, commemorative

memorative, and applicative of that of the Cross: Therefore the sacrifice of the Mass differs essentially from that of the Cross.

Thirdly, Because the sacrifice of the Cross is of an infinite value, and consequently ought not to be reiterated; for its value being infinite, it is sufficient to take away all sins past, present, and to come, as *Bellarmin* saith, *Book 1. of the Mass, chap 4.* But the sacrifice of the Mass is of a finite price and value, according to the same *Bellarmin* and other *Romish Doctors*; at which we may justly wonder, seeing, as our Adversaries say, it differs not from the sacrifice of the Cross, either in respect of the thing sacrificed, or in respect of the chief Priest, and yet from these the sacrifice hath all its price and value.

19. Secondly, I say, that an unbloody propitiatory sacrifice is a feigned, and an imaginary thing, and that the Arguments drawn from the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, do wholly destroy it.

First, Because it is said, *Heb. 9. that without shedding of blood there is no remission of sins:* therefore in the unbloody sacrifice of the Mass, there can be no remission of sins, and consequently it cannot be a propitiatory sacrifice for sin.

Secondly,

Secondly, Because Jesus Christ cannot be offer'd without suffering; for the Apostle saith, *Heb. 6. Jesus Christ offereth not himself often, otherwise he should often have suffered*: But the Sacrifice of Jesus Christ with suffering is a bloody Sacrifice; Therefore there is no unbloody Sacrifice.

Thirdly, Because the bloody Sacrifice of the Cross; being of an infinite value, hath purchased an eternal Redemption, *Heb. 9.* and hath taken away all sins, past, present, and to come. Whence it follows that there is no other Sacrifice, either bloody or unbloody, that can purchase the pardon of our sins, the Sacrifice of the Cross having sufficiently done it.

Fourthly, Because the justice of God requires that sins shall be expiated by the punishment that is due to them; and this is so true that the wrath of God could not be appeased but by the blood and ignominious death of the Cross: Therefore the justice of God must have changed its nature, if sins can be expiated in the Mass without pain, or suffering.

20. Thirdly, To the distinction of Primitive Sacrifice, which was offered on the Cross, and representative, commemorative, and applicative, which is daily offered in the Mass,

I reply, First, That what the Council of Trent saith in *Session 22. viz.* that in the Eucharist there is a Sacrifice representative, commemorative, and applicative, of that of the Cross, may bear a good sense, *viz.* that there is in it a representation, commemoration, and application, of the Sacrifice of the Cross, *viz.* a representation, because the Bread broken, represents the Body broken; and the Wine poured into the Cup, represents the Blood of Christ shed for the remission of sins: a commemoration, because all that is done in it, is done in remembrance of Jesus Christ and his death according to his own command in these words, *Do this in remembrance of me*, and according to what St. Paul saith, *1 Cor. 11. As often as ye do eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come*: and an application, because the merit of the Sacrifice of the Cross is applied to us not only by the word, but also by the Sacraments, as we shall shew hereafter. But our Adversaries are not content with this, for they will have it that in the celebration of the Eucharist, there is offered a true and proper Sacrifice propitiatory for the sins of the living and the dead, which hath been already refuted at large.

Secondly, I say that the application of the Sacri-

Sacrifice of the Cross may be considered on God's part, or on Man's part: on God's part, when he offers Jesus Christ to us, with all his benefits, both in this Word and Sacraments: on man's part, when by a true and living faith, working by love, we imbrace Jesus Christ with all his benefits offered to us both in his Word and Sacraments. And this is that Jesus Christ teacheth us, *St. John 3.* in these words, *As Moses lifted up the Serpent in the Wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up, (viz. on the Cross) that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal Life: For God so loved the World, that he gave his only begotten Son, (viz. to die) that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting Life:* he doth not say whosoever sacrificeth him in the Mass, but whosoever believeth, &c. And *St. Paul* shews it clearly in these words, *God hath set forth Jesus Christ to be a propitiation through Faith in his blood;* he doth not say through the sacrifice of the Mass, but through Faith. And we really and truly apply the Sacrifice of Christ's Cross when we have recourse to him, as a man applies a Plaister when he hath recourse to it, and lays it on the wound; But the recourse or refuge of a penitent sinner to the sacrifice of the Cross for obtaining

obtaining mercy from God, is nothing else but Faith. As for the distinction of the sacramental and natural being of Jesus Christ, it hath been already refuted in the 6. Number.

21. I shall conclude this discourse with the testimony of *Thomas Aquinas*, the most famous of all the *Romish* Doctors, and called by our Adversaries, the Angelical Doctor. This *Thomas* in *Part. 3. Quest. 83. Artic. 1.* having proposed this Question, *viz.* Whether Christ be sacrificed in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, he concludes with these memorable words, *The celebration of this Sacrament is very fitly called a sacrificing of Christ, as well because it is the representation of Christ's Passion, as because by this Sacrament we are made partakers of the fruit of the Lord's Passion.* And afterwards he gives his answer, in these words: *I answer, we must say that the celebration of this Sacrament is called a sacrificing of Christ, in two respects. First, because (as Augustine to Simplicius saith) we are wont to give to Images the name of the things whereof they are Images, as when we see Pictures on a Wall, or in a Frame, we say this is Cicero, that is Salust, &c. But the celebration of this Sacrament (as hath been said above) is a representative Image of Christ's Pas-*

F
sion;

tion; which Passion is the true sacrificing of Christ, and so the celebration of this Sacrament is the sacrificing of Christ. Secondly, the celebration of this Sacrament is called the sacrificing of Christ in regard of the effect of Christ's Passion, because by this Sacrament we are made partakers of the fruit of the Lord's Passion. Let the Romanists keep to this decision of their Angelical Doctor, and we shall agree with them in this point; for I am confident that there is not one of the Reformed Religion but will subscribe this true doctrine of *Thomas Aquinas*.

CHAP. VIII.

Containing Answers to the objections of the Romish Doctors.

1. **I**N the two first Chapters we have answered the two principal Objections of the Romish Doctors, drawn from these words *This is my Body, &c.* and from these, *He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life, &c.* Now we must answer the rest.

Objection 1.

2. The first Objection is this. When the establishing of Articles of Faith, the institution of Sacraments, and the making Testaments

ments and Covenants are in agitation, men speak plainly and properly, and not obscurely or figuratively; But in the celebration of the Eucharist Jesus Christ established an Article of Faith, instituted the Sacrament of the Eucharist, and spake of a Testament and a Covenant: for it is said of the Cup that it is the New Testament and the New Covenant in the blood of Christ; yea, he spake then to his Disciples, to whom he spake in plain and proper terms, and not in obscure terms, or in figures or parables, as he did to the people.

Answer.

3. To this Objection I answer, First, That it is false that Articles of Faith are always expressed in proper terms in holy Scripture, as when it is said in the Creed, that *Jesus Christ sitteth on the right hand of God*, it is evident that this is a Figure and Metaphor, for God being a Spirit, hath neither right hand nor left; and all interpreters expound this sitting on Gods right hand, Metaphorically, viz. for that Lordship both of Heaven and Earth, which he hath received from God his Father, as earthly Princes make their Lieutenants, whom they appoint to govern in their name, to sit on the right side of them. Again when it is

F 2

said,

said, *St. Matth. 16. Upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it, and I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, &c.* It is manifest that these are Figures and Metaphors, as *Bellarmino* confesseth in *Book 1. Of the Bishop of Rome chap. 10.* and yet it is chiefly by this passage that they endeavour to prove the Pope's authority.

4. Secondly, I answer, That the holy Scripture commonly speaks of Sacraments in figurative terms; thus Circumcision is called God's Covenant, *Gen. 17.* in these words, *This is my Covenant, every male shall be circumcised, that is, this is the sign of the Covenant, as appears by the following verse, Ye shall circumcise the flesh of your fore-skin, and it shall be a token of the Covenant between me and you.* So the Paschal Lamb is called the Lord's Passeeover, *Exod. 12.* because the blood of this Lamb sprinkled on the door-Posts, was given as a sign of the Angels favourable passing over the houses of the *Israelites*; as appears by *verse 13.* of the same Chapter. So Baptism is called the washing of Regeneration, because it is the Sacrament of it. In a word, the Eucharistical cup is called the New Testament, because it is the sign, seal and sacrament of it.

5. Thirdly,

5. Thirdly, I answer, that in holy Scripture, Testaments are not always expressed in proper terms without a Figure; for the Testament of *Jacob*, *Gen.* 49. and that of *Moses*, *Deut.* 33. are nothing else but a chain of Metaphors, and other Figures. And Civilians will have it, that in Testaments we should not regard the proper signification of the words, but the intention of the Testator. To this I add that Jesus Christ did not then make the New Testament, and the New Covenant, but only instituted the seal and sacrament of them: For the Covenant was made with all mankind in the person of *Adam* after the Fall, when God promised him that the seed of the Woman should break the Serpents head. This was afterward renewed with *Abraham* when God promised him that in his seed all the Nations of the Earth should be blessed, viz. in Christ, the blessed seed, who hath destroyed the Kingdom of *Satan*. After this it was confirmed by the blood of Christ shed on the Cross: Then it was published through all the World when the Apostles had received the Holy Ghost. And lastly, Baptism and the Eucharist are the signs, seals, and sacraments of it.

said, *St. Matth. 16. Upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it, and I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, &c.* It is manifest that these are Figures and Metaphors, as *Bellarmino* confesseth in *Book 1. Of the Bishop of Rome chap. 10.* and yet it is chiefly by this passage that they endeavour to prove the Pope's authority.

4. Secondly, I answer, That the holy Scripture commonly speaks of Sacraments in figurative terms; thus Circumcision is called God's Covenant, *Gen. 17.* in these words, *This is my Covenant, every male shall be circumcised,* that is, this is the sign of the Covenant, as appears by the following verse, *Ye shall circumcise the flesh of your fore-skin, and it shall be a token of the Covenant between me and you.* So the Paschal Lamb is called the Lord's Paschever, *Exod. 12.* because the blood of this Lamb sprinkled on the door-Posts, was given as a sign of the Angels favourable passing over the houses of the *Israelites*; as appears by *verse 13.* of the same Chapter. So Baptism is called the washing of Regeneration, because it is the Sacrament of it. In a word, the Eucharistical cup is called the New Testament, because it is the sign, seal and sacrament of it.

5. Thirdly,

5. Thirdly, I answer, that in holy Scripture, Testaments are not always expressed in proper terms without a Figure; for the Testament of *Jacob*, *Gen.* 49. and that of *Moses*, *Deut.* 33. are nothing else but a chain of Metaphors, and other Figures. And Civilians will have it, that in Testaments we should not regard the proper signification of the words, but the intention of the Testator. To this I add that Jesus Christ did not then make the New Testament, and the New Covenant, but only instituted the seal and sacrament of them: For the Covenant was made with all mankind in the person of *Adam* after the Fall, when God promised him that the seed of the Woman should break the Serpents head. This was afterward renewed with *Abraham* when God promised him that in his seed all the Nations of the Earth should be blessed, *viz.* in Christ, the blessed seed, who hath destroyed the Kingdom of *Satan*. After this it was confirmed by the blood of Christ shed on the Cross: Then it was published through all the World when the Apostles had received the Holy Ghost. And lastly, Baptism and the Eucharist are the signs, seals, and sacraments of it.

6. Fourthly, I answer, That if by these words, *To speak clearly or plainly*, be understood, to speak intelligibly, so that the Apostles might and ought to understand what he said to them, then it is certain that Jesus Christ did speak clearly; for to speak Sacramentally, and according to the stile used in all Sacraments, was to speak clearly and not obscurely: But if by these words, *to speak clearly*, be understood to speak without a figure, then it is false that he always speaks clearly to his Disciples, witness the calling of his Disciples; to whom he said, *St. Mat. 5. follow me, and I will make you fishers of men*: And when he saith elsewhere, *ye are the salt of the Earth, the light of the World, &c.* To this I add, The Apostles did ask Jesus Christ the meaning of parables and other things which they did not understand, and therefore certainly they had much more reason to ask the meaning of so many strange things as follow from the Mass, from Transubstantiation, and from the pretended presence of Christ's Body in the Host, *viz.* how a humane body can be in a point, and in divers places at once? How the head of Jesus Christ and his whole body could be in his mouth? How accidents can be without a Subject? &c.

7. Lastly,

7. Lastly, Seeing Jesus Christ said, *drink ye all of this cup*, all Priests, whether Jesuites, Monks, or other *Romish* Doctors, would of necessity be constrained, really, properly, and without a figure, to drink of the cup, whether melted or not, and really to swallow it, until they should confess that there are figures in the words of Jesus Christ in the celebration of the Eucharist.

Objection 2.

8. The second Objection is this: The Sacrament of the Eucharist is more excellent than that of the Passeeover, because the Sacrament of the Passeeover is a Type of the Sacrament of the Eucharist, and the thing typified is always more excellent than the Type: But if the Sacrament of the Eucharist did not really contain the Body and Blood of Christ, but was only the sign of it, then it would follow that the Sacrament of the Eucharist would not be more excellent than that of the Passeeover; nay the Sacrament of the Passeeover would be more excellent than that of the Eucharist; because a Lamb and its blood is more excellent than Bread and Wine; and the death of a Lamb and the shedding of its blood doth much better represent the death of Christ, and the shedding of his blood on the Cross,

than Bread broken, and Wine poured into a cup can do.

Answer.

9. To this I answer, First, That the thing typified by the Paschal Lamb, is Jesus Christ and not the Sacrament of the Eucharist ; as *St. Paul* shews clearly, *1 Cor. 5.* when he calls Jesus Christ our Passeeover, in these words, *Christ our Passeeover was Crucified for us.* The truth is, a whole Lamb without spot or blemish killed and burnt toward the evening, and its blood shed, doth very well represent Jesus Christ perfect, without sin, put to death, and his blood shed toward the end of the World, and in the fulness of time ; but such a Lamb represents nothing of that which is seen in the Eucharist. Besides, the Types and Sacraments of the Old Testament were instituted that the Faithful of those times might come to the knowledge of the things typified and signified, for the Salvation of their Souls: But the Faithful under the Old Testament never came to the knowledge of the Eucharist by the Paschal Lamb ; and though they had come to the knowledge of it, yet they had no benefit thereby. In a word, seeing the Passeeover and the Eucharist are Types, Images, and Signs, of Jesus Christ,

tis

'tis very impertinent to say that the Pas-
 sever is the Type of the Eucharist, because
 Type is not properly the Type of that
 Type, but only of the thing typified:
 the Image of *Cæsar* is not the Image of ano-
 ther Image of *Cæsar*, but only of *Cæsar* him-
 self.

10. Secondly, I answer, that the excellence
 of one Sacrament above another, must be
 drawn from its form and efficacy, and not
 from its matter, because it is form that chief-
 ly gives being to things composed of matter
 and form. But the form of Sacraments de-
 pends on the words of Institution; because
 being Signs of divine Institution, their form
 can only depend upon the will of God, who
 chooseth certain things to signify other
 things; and this will of God cannot be known
 but by revelation, which is the Word; so
 that it is properly said, that the word joyned
 with the Element makes the Sacrament:
 Therefore although the Sacrament of the
 Passeever be more excellent than the Eucha-
 rist in respect of its matter, because the Paschal
 Lamb and its blood, are more excellent than
 the Bread and Wine of the Eucharist; and that
 the Lamb and its blood have a greater ana-
 logy with Jesus Christ and his blood shed on

the Cross, than the Bread and Wine of the Eucharist have; yet the Sacrament of the Eucharist is much more excellent than that of the Passeeover in respect of its form, which depends on the words of Institution, because that at the Institution of the Sacrament of the Passeeover, God spake not one word of the principal end for which he did institute it, *viz.* to be the Type of Jesus Christ and his death: But at the Institution of the Sacrament of the Eucharist, Christ declared in expresse terms, that he did institute the eating of the Bread broken, and the drinking of the Wine poured into the Cup, to be commemorative signs of himself, and his death. The Sacrament of the Eucharist is yet more excellent than that of the Passeeover, in respect of its efficacy, which depends on two things, *viz.* on the form, which being more manifest in the Eucharist, doth also operate with more efficacy, and also because it represents a thing past, *viz.* the death of Christ: But the knowledge of things past is more clear and perfect than the knowledge of things to come; and we are more toucht with the memory of things past, when some symbol brings them to our thoughts, than when we consider things to come, through clouds and shadows. To this I add that the Bread and
Wine

Wine of the Eucharist have a greater Analogie with Jesus Christ than the Paschal Lamb had, in one respect, *viz.* in regard of the spiritual nourishment which we receive by Christ's death; for as Baptism is the Sacrament of our spiritual Birth, so the Eucharist is the Sacrament of our spiritual nourishment. But this nourishment is much better represented by Bread and Wine, which are the ordinary nourishment of our bodies, than by a Lamb.

Lastly, I answer, that it is far less inconvenient to give some prerogative to the Pasche over above the Eucharist, (*viz.* to give it a more excellent matter and Analogie) than to assert the corporal presence of Christ in the Host, by an unheard of Transubstantiation, which destroys the nature of Sacraments, gives our Lord a monstrous Body, includes notorious absurdities and contradiction, and gives the lye to Sense, Reason, and holy Scripture; as hath been proved.

Objection 3.

II. The third Objection was proposed at *Nismes, Anno 1657.* by the Jesuite *S. Rigaut*, thus. God doth communicate, or can communicate to the creature in a finite degree that which he possessorh in infinite degree. For example; God hath an infinite power,

power, whereby he can do all things at once; therefore he communicates, or can communicate to the creature a finite and limited power, whereby it may do divers things at once as appears in a man, for he can see, hear, talk, and walk at the same time, God hath also an infinite wisdom and knowledge whereby he knows all things at once; therefore he communicates or can communicate to the creature a finite knowledge, whereby it may know divers things at once. And even so God hath a virtual infinite extent, which is called immensity, whereby he fills all things and all places at once: Therefore God communicates or can communicate to the creature, *viz.* to a body, a finite extent whereby it may fill divers spaces, and occupy several places at once. Whence it follows that Christ's Body may be in divers places at the same time, *viz.* in Heaven and in the Host.

Answer.

12. To this I answer, That as God cannot be in two places (for example in Heaven and upon Earth) without being in all those places that are between both, (for then he would be distant, and separated from himself) so Christ's Body cannot be in two distant places, *viz.* at Paris and at Rome,

in

in Heaven and upon Earth in the Host without being in all those places that are between both; for then it would be distant and separated from it self, which is impossible, as hath been sufficiently proved. Therefore seeing Christ's Body is not in all places between *Paris* and *Rome*, and between Heaven and Earth, it follows that it is not in Heaven and upon Earth in the Host, nor at *Paris* and *Rome* in consecrated Hosts. So that to make a Creature, for example, the Body of Christ, partaker of Gods extent or immensity, it is sufficient that as God by his infinite extent occupies all places, so Christ's Body should by its infinite extent occupy some place. But if to make it partake in a finite degree of this divine attribute of imminity, it must be in divers places, yet it is sufficient that it be in divers places successively, and not at once; or if to make it partake of this attribute it must be in divers places at once; yet it is sufficient that it occupies them by its several parts; for Example, that the Head be in one place, and the Feet in another, &c. In a word, that it be without discontinuance or separation, as God is every where without discontinuance. Thus the learned, Master *Bruguier* then answered,

swered, and much better, but I cannot remember his full and compleat answer.

Objection 4.

13. The fourth Objection is this. If divers bodies may miraculously be in one and the same place, then it also follows, that one body may miraculously be in divers places, there being no more difficulty or impossibility in the one than in the other : But divers bodies may miraculously be in one and the same place ; for Jesus Christ came into the room where his Disciples were the doors being shut, which he could not have done, if his Body had not penetrated the doors. Besides, it is said that Jesus Christ was born of the Virgin *Mary*, and consequently *Mary* was a Virgin both before and after his Birth, which could not have been if Jesus Christ had not penetrated her belly and come forth without fraction or overture. Lastly, Jesus Christ penetrated the stone that was laid on his Sepulchre when he rose again ; and it is said that he penetrated the Heavens when he ascended.

Answer.

14. To this I answer, First, That it is not said that Jesus Christ came in, the doors being shut ; for these are the words, *The same*

same day when it was evening, and the doors having been shut for fear of the Jews, Jesus came, &c. which words do indeed shew the time when Jesus came in unto his Disciples, but not the manner of his entry by penetration ; but if the words be translated, *the doors being shut*, and that they do import that the doors were not opened by any body, yet they do not exclude the opening of them in the twinkling of an eye by the divine power, sith we have examples of this in holy Scripture ; for *Acts 5.* we read that the Apostles went out of Prison, though the doors had been fast shut ; but it is said, that *the Angel of God opened them.* And *Acts 12.* *The door of the Prison opened to St. Peter of its own accord ;* that is, without being opened by any body. And so it is said that Jesus Christ entred, *the doors being shut, or having been shut ;* which excludes the opening of them by any body, but not the opening of them by a divine power in so short a time that it was undiscernable.

Secondly, I answer, That the Virgin Mary was a true Virgin both before and after her delivery, if by being a Virgin be meant not to have had the company of a man ; but it is certain that Jesus Christ came out

out of the Virgins Belly by opening her womb; for it is said, *St. Luke 2.* that *Jeseph and Mary carried Jesus to Jerusalem to present him to the Lord; as it is written in the Law every male that openeth the Womb, shall be holy unto the Lord.*

Thirdly, I answer, that Jesus Christ did not penetrate the stone that was laid on his Sepulchre; for it is said, *St. Matth. 28.* That *the Angel of God rolled it back from the door of the Sepulchre.*

Fourthly, I answer, That when it is said, *Heb. 4.* that Jesus Christ penetrated the Heavens, we must understand it improperly, in the same manner as it is commonly said that an Arrow penetrates the Air; that is, the Air gives way to the Arrow that passeth through the Air; and so Jesus Christ penetrated the Heavens, because the Heavens gave way to his Body, and not that the Heavens and his Body were in one and the same place.

5. All the *Romish* Doctors agree with us, that modal accidents (which are nothing else but the manners of the being of substances; as Action, Passion, Relation, Figure, &c.) cannot be without a subject, no not by the power of God himself. But all the Objections by which they endeavour to prove

prove that the accidents of the Bread and Wine may exist without a subject, (that is, without their substance) do prove the same thing of modal accidents too. So that I shall not stay now to repeat those Objections with their Answers, which are set down at large in my dispute about the Eucharist.

Objection 5.

16. The fifth Objection is drawn from *Mal. 1.* in these words, *From the rising of the sun unto the going down of the same, my Name shall be great among the Gentiles; and in every place shall they offer Incense to my Name, and a new and pure Offering:* Where by this new and pure offering, nothing can be understood but the sacrifice of the Mass; because by this offering we cannot understand Prayers, Alms, Contrition of heart, and other good works, which are sometimes in Scripture called Oblations and Sacrifices: For the Prophet *Malachi* promiseth a new offering; But Prayers, Alms, and other good works were common amongst the Jews; and besides, they of the Reformed Church do believe that all the actions of the faithful are polluted, and the Prophet speaks of a pure and clean offering. Again, by this offering

offering which *Malachi* speaks of, cannot be understood Lambs, Bulls, and such like Animals, which were wont to be sacrificed in *Solomon's* Temple; because the Prophet promiseth that it shall be offered in every place even amongst the Heathen. Lastly, By this offering cannot be understood the bloody Sacrifice which Jesus Christ offered on the Cross, because that bloody Sacrifice was offered but once upon Mount *Calvary* in *Judea*, and the Prophet speaks of an Oblation that shall be offered in every place: Therefore by this offering must be understood the Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ under the species of the Bread and Wine, which is nothing else but the Mass.

Answer.

17. To this I answer, First, That by the offering whereof *Malachi* speaks, must be understood that spiritual Worship and Service which Believers should perform unto God under the New Testament, which is comprised in that sacrifice which they offer to God both of their persons and religious actions; and this is the reason why *St. Paul*, *Rom. 12.* speaks thus, *I beseech you therefore Brethren, by the mercies of God that ye present*
your

our bodies a living Sacrifice, holy, acceptable
unto God, which is your reasonable service. And
chap. 15. speaking of the grace that was given
him of God, he saith, it is given him that he
should be Minister of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles,
ministring the Gospel of God, that the offering up
of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being sancti-
fied by the Holy Ghost. Whence it appears, that
by this oblation whereof *Malachi* speaks, we
must not understand the offering of Christ's
Body and Blood under the accidents, of
Bread and Wine, but the offering up of the
persons and religious actions of those that
should be brought unto God by the preach-
ing of the Gospel, and particularly the Gen-
tiles.

18. Secondly, I answer, That in the
whole passage of *Malachi* above cited, the
words *new offering* are not to be found, but
only *clean offering*. And though a new of-
fering had been there spoken of, yet I say
that things may be said to be new, when be-
ing spoiled and corrupted, they are restor-
ed and made sound again. But the service of
God which had been corrupted under the
Law, was re established by Jesus Christ and
his Apostles under the Gospel, so that all
things were made new : a new Time, viz.
the

the time of the preaching of the Gospel ; a new People, *viz.* the Christian People ; a new place, *viz.* all parts of the World, and not at *Jerusalem* only ; a new Prayer, *viz.* the Lord's Prayer ; new Sacraments, *viz.* Baptism and the Lord's Supper ; and new Preaching, *viz.* the preaching of Salvation by Jesus Christ.

19. Thirdly, I answer, that the Oblation which is offered unto God under the Gospel, is pure and clean ; the service which is performed to him, according to his Word, is pure ; the preaching of the Gospel is pure. In a word, the Christian Religion is pure, though there be many failings in those that profess it : And although the Faithful that present their bodies a living Sacrifice, Holy, acceptable to God, be compassed about with many infirmities, and that their Religious actions be accompanied with divers failings, yet their persons and works may be said to be pure and clean in Jesus Christ, in whose name they are presented to God ; so that although they cannot of themselves please or satisfy God ; yet as they are Members of Christ they are reputed holy before God ; For it is these *St. Peter* speaks of in *Epist. 1 chap. 2. who, as living stones, are built up a spiritual house, a holy Priesthood, to offer*

offer up spiritual Sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ. And so our sacrifices are a pure and clean offering, but it is through Jesus Christ, who covers them with his purity and holiness, so that the defects of them are not imputed to us. To this I add, That besides the perfect purity which we have by the imputation of Christ's Righteousness, we have also a purity begun by the Holy Ghost; of which St. Paul speaks *Rom. 15.* in these words, *that the offering of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost;* for that which God hath decreed, Jesus Christ hath purchased, and the Holy Ghost hath begun, is reputed by God perfect and compleat. And St. Paul shews clearly the truth of what hath been said. *1 Tim. 2. 8.* in these words, *I will that men pray every where, lifting up holy hands, without wrath and doubting.* And *Ephes. 5.* *Jesus Christ loved the Church, and gave himself for it, that he might Sanctifie and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself, a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish.*

Objection 6.

20. The sixth Objection is drawn from *Gen. 14.* in these words : *And Melchisedec King of Salem, bringing forth Bread and Wine (for he was a Priest) blessed him.* And from *Psal. 110.* and from *Heb. 7.* where it is said, *Thou art Priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec.* From which words our Adversaries argue thus. First, They say that Jesus Christ is a Priest, not after the Order of *Aaron*, but after the order of *Melchisedec*; the difference between *Aaron* and *Melchisedec* consisting in this *viz.* that *Aaron* and the other Levitical Priests offered bloody Sacrifices, killing and shedding the blood of Beasts, which they sacrificed to God, as a Sign and Figure of the bloody sacrifice of Jesus Christ on the Cross. But *Melchisedec* offered an unbloody sacrifice; for when he went to meet *Abraham* returning from the slaughter of the Kings, he offered to God Bread and Wine. And seeing this Bread and Wine offered to God by *Melchisedec* were signs and Types of Christ's Body and Blood, Jesus Christ was obliged to offer an unbloody sacrifice, *viz.* his Body and Blood under the species of Bread and Wine, which he did.

at the institution and celebration of the Sa-
 crament of the Eucharist, that so the reality
 of the thing typified might answer those sha-
 dows and Types. Secondly, That although
Melchisedec had brought all this Bread and
 Wine for the refreshment of *Abraham* and
 his Army that returned from the slaughter of
 the Kings, yet he first offered it to God, and
 then gave it to them, that so they might par-
 take of the sacrifice of Bread and Wine. And
 the reason of this is, because the Scripture
 saith that *Abraham* returned from the Battle
 with great spoils; among which there was
 meat and drink enough for the refreshment
 of himself and his People: also it saith expres-
 sly that *Abraham's* People had taken such re-
 freshment as was necessary before *Melchise-
 dec* met them; and consequently they had no
 need of the Bread and Wine which he brought,
 except it had been to partake of the sacrifice
 of the Bread and Wine which he offered.
 Thirdly, They say this is strongly proved by
 the following words, *for he was Priest of the
 most high God*, which shews the reason why
Melchisedec brought Bread and Wine, viz. to
 make an oblation or offering of it to God;
 or if he had brought this Bread and Wine
 for the refreshment of *Abraham* and his Peo-
 ple,

Objection 6.

20. The sixth Objection is drawn from *Gen. 14.* in these words : *And Melchisedec King of Salem, bringing forth Bread and Wine (for he was a Priest) blessed him.* And from *Psal. 110.* and from *Heb. 7.* where it is said, *Thou art a Priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec.* From which words our Adversaries argue thus. First, They say that *Jesus Christ* is a Priest, not after the Order of *Aaron*, but after the order of *Melchisedec*; the difference between *Aaron* and *Melchisedec* consisting in this *viz.* that *Aaron* and the other Levitical Priests offered bloody Sacrifices, killing and shedding the blood of Beasts, which they sacrificed to God, as a Sign and Figure of the bloody sacrifice of *Jesus Christ* on the Cross. But *Melchisedec* offered an unbloody sacrifice; for when he went to meet *Abraham* returning from the slaughter of the Kings, he offered to God Bread and Wine. And seeing this Bread and Wine offered to God by *Melchisedec* were signs and Types of *Christ's* Body and Blood, *Jesus Christ* was obliged to offer an unbloody sacrifice, *viz.* his Body and Blood under the species of Bread and Wine, which he did

at the institution and celebration of the Sacrament of the Eucharist, that so the reality of the thing typified might answer those shadows and Types. Secondly, That although *Melchisedec* had brought all this Bread and Wine for the refreshment of *Abraham* and his Army that returned from the slaughter of the Kings, yet he first offered it to God, and then gave it to them, that so they might partake of the sacrifice of Bread and Wine. And the reason of this is, because the Scripture saith that *Abraham* returned from the Battle with great spoils; among which there was meat and drink enough for the refreshment of himself and his People: also it saith expressly that *Abraham's* People had taken such refreshment as was necessary before *Melchisedec* met them; and consequently they had no need of the Bread and Wine which he brought, except it had been to partake of the sacrifice of the Bread and Wine which he offered. Thirdly, They say this is strongly proved by the following words, *for he was Priest of the most high God*, which shews the reason why *Melchisedec* brought Bread and Wine, *viz.* to make an oblation or offering of it to God; for if he had brought this Bread and Wine for the refreshment of *Abraham* and his People,

ple,

ple, the Scripture would have said that he had brought this Bread and Wine, because that *Abraham* and his Army being faint and tired had need of meat and drink; but it speaks nothing of this: On the contrary it saith that he brought Bread and Wine, *for he was Priest*. Fourthly, They say that *Jesus Christ is a Priest for ever, after the order of Melchisedec*; and seeing there can be no Priest without a Sacrifice there can be no eternal Priest without an eternal or perpetual sacrifice. But the sacrifice of the Cross was offered but once, and cannot be reiterated, *for Jesus Christ dyeth no more*. Rom. 6. Therefore there must be another perpetual sacrifice in the Church, which *Jesus Christ* offereth by the hands of Priests, which can be nothing else but the sacrifice of the Mass, *viz.* the sacrifice of Christs Body and Blood under the species of the Bread and Wine, typified by the sacrifice of the Bread and Wine of *Melchisedec*.

Answer.

21. To this I answer, First, That the Hebrew word doth not signifie *bringing* but *brought*, drew out, caused to be brought &c. but our Adversaries falsifie the Text

thus, to make way for another falsification, viz. to put these words in a Parenthesis, (*for he was Priest*;) instead of putting without a Parenthesis, *and he was a Priest*; so that we may say in these few words they have made three falsifications, first, when they translate it *proferens*, that is bringing, instead of translating it *protulit*, that is brought or drew out: Secondly, when they translate it *erat enim Sacerdos*, that is, *for he was a Priest*: instead of translating it, *and he was a Priest*. Thirdly, when they translate it *benedixit ei*, that is, *blest him* instead of translating it *& benedixit ei*, that is *and he blest him*. And so of three different propositions, viz. *Melchisedec* also brought Bread and Wine, and he was Priest, and he blest him; they have made but one, with a Parenthesis thus: *Melchisedec* bringing Bread and Wine (*for he was a Priest*) blest him.

22. Secondly, I answer that the Hebrew word used by *Moses*, signifies commonly brought, drew out, caused to be brought, caused to be drawn out, caused to come, &c. But we must not stray from the proper signification of words but upon very great necessity, which appears not in this Text. And although this Hebrew word should signifie *brought to offer*, and that it should be taken

for *offered*, yet our Adversaries would gain nothing by it ; for it is not said in the Text that he brought Bread and Wine to offer unto God ; but we must rather expound it thus, *viz.* that he brought Bread and Wine to offer and present it to *Abraham* : And indeed the following words, *viz. and blessed him*, do clearly shew it, for the Pronoun Relative *him*, relates to *Abraham*, according to the exposition of the Apostle, *Heb. 7.* where he saith expressly that *Melchisedec met Abraham and blessed him*. And a little after he saith, that *Melchisedec blessed him that had the promises ; and that the less is blessed of the greater*. But if these words, *he brought Bread and Wine*, must be expounded thus, he offered Bread and Wine to God, then it must necessarily follow that *Melchisedec* blessed God and not *Abraham* ; for in these words, *viz.* he offered Bread and Wine to God, and blessed him, the Pronoun *him* can relate to none but God.

23. Thirdly, I answer, That *Melchisedec* brought Bread and Wine to *Abraham* to refresh him and his People, and not to offer unto God. *Bellarmino* in *Book 1. of the Mass, chap. 6.* confesseth that *Melchisedec* brought Bread and Wine to *Abraham* to refresh him and his People, who returned faint and tired from

from the slaughter of the Kings, which is true; but he adds that Jesus Christ had offered it to God before, which is false, and cannot be proved. *Jerom* in his Epistle to *Evagrius* writes that the Jews understood it that *Melchisedec* meeting *Abraham* after his victory, brought Bread and Wine to refresh him and his People. *Josephus* writing this History, saith that *Melchisedec* presented Bread and Wine to *Abraham* to refresh him and his Army. *Damascene*, Book 4. of the *Orthodox Faith*, saith, that *Melchisedec* treated *Abraham* with Bread and Wine.

24. Fourthly, The Reasons of our Adversaries, mentioned in the Objections to prove that *Melchisedec* brought Bread and Wine to *Abraham* that he might partake of the Sacrifice which he had offered, are not considerable; viz. because *Abraham* returned from the Battle with great spoils, and so there was meat and drink enough for him and his People; and that they had taken their repast before *Melchisedec* met them, &c. These Reasons, I say, are inconsiderable, because although *Abraham* had great spoils, yet he restored all to the King of *Sodom*, and though his People had eaten and drank of such as they found amongst the spoils, yet it is not said that *Abraham* did

eat and drink ; and though both he and his People had eaten and drank, yet it is not said how long it was since, and that they had no need of more provision ; and though they had no need of more, yet *Melchisedec* not knowing that they had eaten and drank, did that which prudent men ~~may~~ ^{ought} to do, viz. provide all that may be needful in case of necessity.

35. Fifthly, I answer, that the principal reason which our adversaries bring to prove that *Melchisedec* offered unto God Bread and Wine, viz. because it is in the Hebrew Text *for he was Priest*, is a manifest falsification, for it is in the Hebrew Text, *and he was Priest*; Also the old Latine Interpreter, and the Greek Septuagint translate it as we do, viz. *and he was Priest*. And it is very probable that this passage hath been corrupted in *Jerom's* Latine Translation, because in his Hebrew Questions, and in his Epistle to *Evagrius*, he translates it, *and he was Priest*. St. *Cyprian* in his Epistle to *Cæcilius*, and St. *Augustin*, Book 4. of *Christian Doctrine*, chap. 12. and elsewhere translate it, *and he was Priest*. So that although the Hebrew particle used by *Moses*, do sometimes signifie, *for*, yet seeing that both its proper and common signification is
and;

and; and for that one place where it signifies for, there are a thousand at least where it signifies *and*; and that there is nothing that obligeth us to translate it *for*, it is evident that the Argument of our Adversaries is of no force at all. Therefore it is more pertinent to refer these words, *and he was Priest*, to what follows, *viz. and blessed him*, than to what goes before, *viz. brought Bread and Wine*. For as *Melchisedec*, being a liberal King, brought Bread and Wine to *Abraham*, to refresh him and his People; so as he was a Priest much more excellent than *Abraham*, he blessed him. And though it should be translated *for he was Priest*, yet it would not follow that *Melchisedec* did Sacrifice Bread and Wine unto God, for it might be said that *Moses* would shew the reason of the good will of *Melchisedec* toward *Abraham*; *viz.* it was very fit that he that was Priest of the most high God, should testify his kindness to so eminent a servant of God as was *Abraham*, by presenting Bread and Wine to him, whereof he thought there was need.

26. Sixthly, I answer, That from what is said, *Psal. 110.* and *Heb. 7.* *viz.* that Jesus Christ is a Priest for ever, it will not follow that he must offer himself every day

in the Mass, under the species of Bread and Wine, by the Ministry of Priests ; for the Apostle writing to the *Hebrews*, placeth the perpetuity of the Priesthood partly in this, *viz.* that there is no need he should be offered any more, seeing by one oblation he hath consecrated for ever those that are sanctified; and partly in this, *viz.* that being exalted far above the Heavens, he interceeds continually for us; for the Priesthood consists in certain functions, and in the vertue and efficacy of them. And seeing there are two parts of Christ's Priesthood, whereof one relates to the oblation of himself, which he offered on the Cross, and the other to his intercession ; it is certain that the vertue and efficacy of the oblation is eternal, and that the intercession will continue unto the end of the World.

27. Seventhly, I answer, That in all the Holy Scripture where the Priesthood of *Melchisedec* is spoken of, three things only are mentioned of him, *viz.* that he was a Priest, that he was a Priest for ever, and that he was so with an oath, according to the Application that is made of it to Jesus Christ in *Psalms* 110. and *Heb.* 7 in these words, *The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent, thou art a Priest for ever, after the order of Melchisedec ;*

dec; but there is nothing at all spoken of the Sacrifice of *Melchisedec*, nor is it said wherein it did consist; for as it was fit that all the offices which we find, were born by the greatest Kings, Priests, and Prophets under the Old Testament, should be collected in the person of *Messiah*; which was done by proposing them as Types and Figures of Jesus Christ; and that the most illustrious Type was *Melchisedec*; so it was more expedient not to speak of the nature of the Sacrifice of *Melchisedec*, because it was not expedient then to speak of the nature of the Sacrifice of the Messiah. And therefore although we know not the nature and quality of the Sacrifice of *Melchisedec*, yet we know that he was a Priest: Even as we know not in what manner he executed his Kingly office.

28. Lastly, I answer, that it is false that the difference between the Priesthood of *Melchisedec* and that of *Aaron* did consist in this, *viz.* that *Aaron* offered the bloody sacrifices of Beasts, and *Melchisedec* offered an unbloody Sacrifice of Bread and Wine. It is also false that the likeness of the Priesthood of *Melchisedec* to that of Jesus Christ doth consist in this, *viz.* that as *Melchisedec* did sacrifice Bread and Wine, so Christ did sacrifice

crifice his Body and Blood under the species of Bread and Wine: these are humane inventions, and are founded neither on Scripture nor Reason, for on the contrary, the Apostle writing to the *Hebrews*, placeth the difference between the Priesthood of *Melchisedec* and that of *Aaron*, and its likeness to that of Christ is quite another thing. First, He is called *Melchisedec*, which being interpreted (as the Apostle saith, *Heb. 7.*) is King of Righteousness; and then King of *Salem*, that is, King of Peace; and herein he very well represents our Lord Jesus Christ, who is truly King of Righteousness, not only because he is Righteous, and was always without sin; but also because by his satisfaction he hath purchased Righteousness for us, *being made unto us of God, Righteousness*. He is also truly King of Peace, in that he hath reconciled men unto God, made their peace with the Angels, and hath particularly recommended peace to them. As for *Aaron* and other High Priests, they were no Kings, much less are the Priests of the *Romish Church* so, and consequently cannot be after the order of *Melchisedec*; and they that have written the lives of the Popes have sufficiently declared what Righteousness and Peace they have procured for the true and faithful ser-

vants

vants of Jesus Christ, as I shall shew at large
 elsewhere. Secondly, The Apostle, *Heb. 7.*
 represents *Melchisedec* to us as a man come
 from Heaven, *without Father, without Mother,*
without descent, having neither beginning of days
nor end of Life: nor that he was really such
 a one, but because *Moses* hath wholly con-
 cealed from us his Father, Mother, Descent,
 Birth and Death, that he might be the Type
 of Christ, who was without Father, as he is
 Man without Mother as God; without de-
 scent both as God and as Man; having nei-
 ther beginning of days as God, nor end of
 Life as God, or as Man. But the Fathers,
 Descent, Birth, Death of *Aaron*, and other
 High Priests are exactly described by *Moses*.
 And there were never any Popes, Bishops,
 or Priests, whose Parents, Birth, and Death,
 were not known, and consequently they can-
 not be after the order of *Melchisedec*. Third-
 ly, The Apostle adds, that *Melchisedec be-*
ing made like unto the Son of God, abideth a
Priest for ever; because *Moses* makes no men-
 tion of his Death, nor of any one that suc-
 ceeded him in his Priestly Office; that so
 he might be the Type of Jesus Christ, who
 never left his Priestly Office, but will exer-
 cise it until the end of the World, always
 interceding for those that are his, by pre-
 senting

sending his Sacrifice to God the Father continually. As for *Aaron* and other Priests they are dead, and have had successors. And the Popes, Bishops, and Priests, die daily, and have successors ; and consequently are not after the order of *Melchisedec*. Fourthly, The Apostle saith likewise, that *Melchisedec* took Tithes of *Abraham*, and adds that *Melchisedec* blessed him that had the Promises, viz. *Abraham*; and that the less is blessed of the greater. Whence it appears that *Melchisedec* having taken Tithes of *Abraham*, and blessed him, and *Levi*, and all the Priests in his person, was more excellent than *Abraham*, *Levi*, and all the Priests : In which respect he was a Type of Jesus Christ, who was infinitely more excellent than *Abraham* and his successors, because he in whom all the promises were fulfilled, must needs be incomparably more excellent than he that received them only. But I do not believe that the Priests of the *Romish* Church are so bold as to prefer themselves before *Abraham* the Father of the Faithful, in whose Seed all the Nations of the earth are blessed ; and consequently are not after the Order of *Melchisedec*. Fifthly, The Apostle never spake of the Sacrifice of *Melchisedec*, so far was he from comparing it with the sacrifice of Je-
 ius

Jesus Christ, as being like it, or with that of Aaron, as being unlike it; so that all that our Adversaries say of it, is nothing else but meer humane invention.

29. I conclude my answer with this Argument, Jesus Christ hath offered no Sacrifice but after the order whereof he was established a Priest: But he was established a Priest after the order of *Melchisedec* only, as the Apostle observes: Therefore he hath offered no sacrifice but after the Order of *Melchisedec*: But (according to the *Romish* Doctors) there is no other Sacrifice after the Order of *Melchisedec*, but that of the Mass: Therefore (according to the *Romish* Doctors) Jesus Christ hath offered no other Sacrifice but that of the Mass. And seeing (according to them) the Sacrifice of the Mass is an unbloody Sacrifice, it follows that Jesus Christ hath offered no other Sacrifice, but an unbloody Sacrifice; and consequently he hath not offered a bloody Sacrifice on the Cross, which is blasphemy.



THE END.